Missouri
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
EDUCATION™
Office of Special Education

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT
MISSOURI PART B
2011-12

Submitted February 1, 2013
Office of Special Education

Table of Contents

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-2012
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

The following provides overarching information pertinent to this Annual Performance Report for 2011-12 (Federal Fiscal Year 2011 which covers the time period from July 1, 2011, to June 30, 2012).

Development of the Annual Performance Report (APR)

Process Used to Develop the APR
Staff from the Compliance and Effective Practices sections of the Office of Special Education, staff from the Data Coordination section of the Office of Data System Management and staff from the Special Education Funds Management section of the Division of Financial and Administrative Services met regularly throughout the year to review and analyze data related to State Performance Plan (SPP) targets to determine whether SPP improvement activities are being implemented and are effective in helping the state meet its targets. Tools such as the OSEP SPP/APR Calendar are used to help the workgroup structure its activities, and an internal tool that outlines detailed action steps for improvement activities was also developed and is used regularly as a management tool.

Stakeholder input is also crucial, and a draft of the APR and proposed SPP changes in targets and improvement activities are presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) prior to submission for their review and input.

Data Collection and Reporting

Public Reporting of District Data
Public reports of 2011-12 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (the Department) Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) Portal website. The Special Education Profiles are posted under Summary Reports at mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target for the state.

Public Reporting of Statewide Data
The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on the Department's website at dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/MOProfile.pdf as well as with the District Profiles on the MCDS Portal. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident. In addition, the SPP and APR documents are posted on the Department website at dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a Special Education Listserv which disseminates important information on special education topics to a wide range of stakeholders. These resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

MOSIS and Core Data
The Department began the transition to collecting student level data during the 2007-08 school year through the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS). Prior to that, the Core Data Collection System (a web-based data collection system with interactive edits) was used to gather data from districts. MOSIS includes a variety of edit checks which help school districts maintain more accurate information and manage student data more efficiently. Most Special Education data are collected through MOSIS and these data are used for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 14.

Department Contract Development and Management System in FormHog
In May 2008, the Office of Special Education contracted with the company FormHog, Inc. to create and provide an online contract development and management system. The purpose of this system is to develop scopes of work and budgets, provide a central location for vendor contact information, store

information related to vendor contracts (e.g., contract appendices, signed contract agreements, reports, and invoices), store all definitions for terms used in the development of forms, and track vendor programmatic, impact, and fiscal activities. An approval process is built into the system to facilitate work flow for scope of work and budget development, processing invoices and reviewing reports. A data query and reporting tool has been developed. This tool enables Office of Special Education and other Department staff to evaluate vendor activities and use of funds and determine the alignment of vendor activities with SPP Improvement Activities and Indicators.

Data Team Training
During the 2011-12 school year the Department partnered with the Leadership and Learning Center to train State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) staff in a Decision Making for Results (DMR) and Data Teams (DT) process to be used throughout the state. The data team training demonstrates how to implement data-driven decision making at the classroom-practitioner level. Data teams provide a structure for teachers to specifically identify areas of student need and collaboratively decide on the best instructional approach in response to those needs. This process assists schools and districts across Missouri in identifying successful teaching and leadership practices that serve as measureable indicators within an effective holistic accountability system.

Systems Administration and Monitoring

IMACS
The Office of Special Education has a web-based general supervision management system: Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS). IMACS was first used by districts during the 2006–07 school year and data from the system are used to address districts' performance on the SPP Indicators. The components of the system include improvement planning, compliance file reviews, corrective action plans, disproportionality and discipline reviews and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through the Department's MOSIS/Core Data collection system. IMACS is used by districts to submit required information to the Office of Special Education for either the cyclical review process or for grant applications. IMACS is also available for districts to use on a voluntary basis so that improvement planning, implementation and evaluation can be on-going procedures for the district and districts can conduct compliance file reviews at any time to self-monitor compliance with state and federal requirements.

Federal Tiered Monitoring Three Year Cohort Cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators
Beginning in 2010-11, the Department moved from a five year to a three year cohort cycle for monitoring all federal programs, including special education. This monitoring/general supervision system is a tiered monitoring process including the following four tiers: desk audit, desk review, phone audit and onsite monitoring. Based upon threshold levels related to the targets established in the SPP, districts are required to complete self assessment activities related to the identified SPP targets not met. If, during their tiered monitoring year, a district did not meet a performance threshold, the district is required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the indicator not met and is also required to conduct focused student file reviews of compliance indicators related to any performance area not met.

In addition to a focused file review, the Office of Special Education (OSE) requires a file review for all districts during their monitoring year in the areas of postsecondary transition (Indicator 13), referral, review of existing data and evaluation based on identified statewide concerns in these areas. The Office of Special Education also collects data on initial evaluations and Part C to B transition timelines and monitors for compliance in these areas.

Corrective action plans are required for all identified noncompliance and any findings of noncompliance must be corrected within 12 months of the district's notification of the findings. In order to verify correction of noncompliance, additional data are requested as part of a follow-up review. These data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and districts may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified. Districts are expected to correct findings of individual child noncompliance within 90 days, but in no case more than 12 months, of the receipt of the report of findings of

noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. Compliance supervisors request documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected and any other required actions (such as compensatory services or evaluations completed) have been put in place.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of IMACS and frequent contact with the districts by Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) consultants and Department supervisors. Districts are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months when they attend the required self-assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of noncompliance.

Onsite Reviews
Missouri has continued to refine the focused monitoring onsite process based on its experience with pilot focused monitoring in 2004–05 and 2005–06 and its work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM). The Office of Special Education's focused monitoring process is now part of the three year cohort for tiered monitoring. In 2011-12, 14 districts were selected for focused monitoring onsite reviews based upon data demonstrating a significant need for improvement in post secondary transition (graduation and/or dropout rates) and/or elementary achievement (performance on the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)). Based upon the data, seven of the fourteen districts were identified for review in both the areas of elementary achievement and post secondary transition, five of the fourteen districts were identified in only the area of elementary achievement and two of the fourteen districts were identified in only the area of post secondary transition. Data analysis by Department staff and RPDC consultants occurred prior to the review and hypotheses were developed to identify root causes of the district's area(s) in need of improvement. While onsite, the reviews included individual and group interviews of special and regular education staff, parents, and students, as well as file reviews and classroom observations. All information gathered was reviewed by the team and used to support or refute the hypothesis. Exit conferences were held with district staff to report the team's findings and answer any questions from the districts.

Within six weeks of the review, the districts received reports of the onsite review which included a corrective action plan, when necessary. The districts were required to report on activities related to the areas identified through an Improvement Plan and subsequent activity reports.

Improvement Planning and Scoring Guide
Improvement planning is used for both improvement grant application purposes and for district monitoring. A template for improvement plans was developed that functions as both a grant application and a self-assessment tool for special education monitoring purposes. The state worked with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) for the initial development of the improvement plan and scoring guide. The improvement plan is based on the Department's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and is part of IMACS and Electronic Plans and Electronic Grants System (ePeGS).

The improvement plan is structured to include a comprehensive needs assessment, objectives with targets and benchmarks, and strategies with action steps and impact measures. An important part of the improvement plan is a scoring guide that itemizes and prioritizes the factors the Department will use when evaluating the improvement plans for either grant or self-assessment purposes. The scoring guide makes it clear to districts what is expected in an approvable improvement plan. Activity reports are required from grant districts twice yearly so that implementation and progress can be monitored. Activity reports are also required based upon the results of a focused monitoring review.

The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for identified performance targets complete an improvement plan to address areas in need of improvement. Districts completing improvement plans analyze data as a part of the needs assessment. Identified improvement areas are addressed through objectives and strategies.

Monitoring Process for Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)
CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special

education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. A Lead Education Agency (LEA) may not use more than 15% of the amount the agency receives under Part B for any fiscal year, less any amount reduced by the agency under adjustments to local fiscal year effort (34 CFR 300.205), if any, in combination with other amounts (which may include amounts other than education funds), to develop and implement CEIS. LEAs using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to the Department through 1) ePeGS on the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER), starting with the 2008–09 FER, and 2) the CEIS Reporting Verification Sheet (RVS). The amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the RVS must match the amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the Part B FER. Both the RVS and Part B FER are due September 30th each year.

LEAs that provide CEIS using Part B IDEA funds must report the following on the FER:
- Professional development provided to teachers and other school staff
- Detail of what educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction was provided
- Number of students who received CEIS using IDEA Part B funds who were not eligible for IDEA services at the time they received these services from the LEA during the school year
- Of the students who had IEPs during this school year, the number that had received CEIS using IDEA funds anytime in the past two school years

LEAs that provide CEIS using Part B IDEA funds must report the following on the CEIS RVS:
- Date the CEIS activity occurred
- Description of the CEIS activity that occurred
- Cost of the CEIS activity
- Titles of all participants that attended the activity (i.e. 4th Grade Reading Teacher)
- Number of Special Education Students served by the CEIS activity (this number should be zero as CEIS is for students without an IEP)
- Funding source to verify that districts are not supplanting with CEIS funds
- Group(s) benefiting from the CEIS activity

The CEIS information submitted is reviewed by Special Education Finance staff, in consultation with Department staff from the Special Education Compliance, Effective Practices, and Data Coordination sections.

Upon review of LEA documentation, Special Education Finance staff informs LEAs of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the LEA is required to return these funds.

Program Development

Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants
The Office of Special Education has been awarding improvement grants to districts on a competitive basis for the past five years. The improvement plan described above in the "Improvement Planning and Scoring Guide" section serves as the grant application. District training on improvement planning with scoring guides is held in the fall of each year and is available to all districts in the state. The intent is to strengthen the improvement planning process at the district level in order to promote systemic changes leading toward improved outcomes for students with disabilities. The districts submit activity reports during the year which serve as both a progress and expenditure report.

Grants were awarded in 2011-12 in the area of Elementary Achievement to 73 schools to be implemented in the 2012–13 school year. Personnel in these districts received professional development to support initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RtI), Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Co-Teaching, Check and Connect, Differentiated Instruction (DI), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) and Aimsweb.

In addition, 60 grants were awarded for improvement in post-secondary outcomes of students with disabilities for 2012-13. Personnel in these districts received professional development to support initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RtI), Transition Outcome Project (TOP), Co-teaching, Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Wilson Reading, Differentiated Instruction (DI), Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Check and Connect, Curriculum Based Measurements (CBM), High Schools That Work (HSTW) and Aimsweb.

2011–12 Special Education Improvement Grant Activities	
Districts that Attended Fall 2011 RPDC Training	240
Grant Applications Received	248
Grant Applications Approved	133
EA Grant Applications Approved	73
PST Grant Applications Approved	60

Overall, 98 districts were awarded 73 elementary achievement and 60 secondary transition grants in 2011–12 to be implemented during the 2012–13 school year. Grants continue to fund professional development to support the implementation of systems change initiatives.

Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (MO SW-PBS)
The mission of Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (MO SW-PBS) is to assist schools and districts in establishing and maintaining effective social behavior systems in order to improve academic and behavior outcomes for all students.

The MO SW-PBS initiative is comprised of the following personnel:
- State Coordinator
- Assistant State Coordinator
- Data/Web Consultant
- Secondary/Tertiary Consultants (5)
- Regional Consultants (24)

The state coordinator guides the implementation of the statewide system of SW-PBS technical assistance for Missouri. Efforts primarily focus on directing the daily activities of the initiative and on providing ongoing training and technical assistance to MO SW-PBS staff. Other primary responsibilities include revising the current scope and sequence of training across all three tiers and collaborating with Regional consultants to ensure the training content aligns with the scope and sequence; coordinating the State Leadership Team; collaborating with other state initiatives, Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) directors and Department personnel; and assuring that the work of all consultants is aligned with their responsibilities as outlined in their scopes of work. The assistant state coordinator supports the state coordinator in implementing Missouri's statewide system of SW-PBS.

The data/web consultant is in the process of formalizing a cohesive system of MO SW-PBS data collection available for review at school, district and state levels. This position also develops data training curriculum that is presented to MO SW-PBS staff and school district personnel. In addition, the data/web consultant offers statewide support through postings of various resources on the MO SW-PBS website. The secondary/tertiary consultants guide secondary and tertiary tier implementation for schools/districts that have met criteria at the universal level. These consultants also train regional consultants to offer implementation assistance at these tiers. The regional consultants provide school- and district-level support across a spectrum of implementation areas.

The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team is continuing to develop statewide standardized training for various audiences at school, district, regional and state levels. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.

The MO SW-PBS initiative has expanded from 275 schools in 2006 to 738 schools in 2012 at the elementary and secondary levels. Data collected through the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) and the state-developed MO SW-PBS School Data Profile, along with other Department data sources, indicate that schools/districts participating in the state SW-PBS initiative show improvements in student attendance, achievement and placement in the least restrictive environment.

Active MO SW-PBS schools are categorized into an implementation phase based on established criteria. The categories include Preparatory, Emerging, Bronze, Silver and Gold. In June 2012, 267 schools were recognized for having met the criteria for Bronze, Silver or Gold levels. These schools qualify as state demonstration sites that share data and information on implementation of MO SW-PBS with the state as well as other schools. Additional information regarding MO SW-PBS, including schools serving as demonstration sites, may be accessed at pbismissouri.org.

Response to Intervention (RtI)
Department school improvement efforts have continued to focus on alignment of tiered models of intervention as an effective and efficient organizational framework to facilitate systems change. Further, practices within these models that utilize a comprehensive data collection and decision-making process have been emphasized. The following items update work related to RtI and tiered systems of support work completed over the past year.

Missouri Alignment Group: The Missouri Alignment Group, comprised of Department staff representing RtI, Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM), continued to communicate and align efforts/practices across tiered intervention models. This group continues to meet monthly to discuss a variety of issues related to the tiered model work (data collection, shared learning opportunities, curriculum, model updates etc.).

RtI Training Modules: Three comprehensive RtI training modules developed by the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRtI) are currently undergoing review and revision within the Department. Many regional technical assistance staff are currently using portions of the module material in their current training/PD activities related to RtI.

RtI Development Sites: The Department identified twelve buildings within five Missouri school districts to participate in RtI development site work. These buildings represent a range from pre-K to secondary grade levels. These development site districts contribute to the Department's understanding of RtI implementation by school districts and buildings across the state.

Tools to Assess Implementation: Two tools were used to assess RtI implementation status in each Development Site. The first tool is the NCRtI's RtI Integrity Rubric (NCRtI: www.rti4success.org) which is an implementation self-assessment tool. The second tool is an RtI Action Planning Template, developed by the Development Site Coordinator in collaboration with the NCRtI, which is a more in depth implementation planning tool. The RtI Integrity Rubric includes a repeated focus on fidelity in multiple areas, including assessment and tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction. General findings from analysis of implementation status using these tools reveal a general weakness across sites in the areas of articulating procedures within the tiers or levels of support, intensifying instruction and assessment across the tiers or levels, and measuring fidelity of the implementation of those procedures.

Technical Assistance Focus: This year's technical assistance focus has been on data analysis strategies to inform decision-making at multiple levels, particularly ways of looking at multiple sources of assessment data to triangulate student abilities, set goals that are clearly linked to achievement targets (i.e., MAP and EOC proficiency), and monitor progress and predict achievement gains. An additional focus of technical assistance this year was to provide a framework for RtI implementation evaluation using the work of Shapiro & Clemens. Generalized technical assistance was delivered at Development Site quarterly meetings held in October, January, and March.

Professional Development: Professional development conducted in sites during FY12 focused on varied topics, reflecting the various implementation issues sites struggle with and choose to focus on. Topics

included data analysis strategies, early childhood RtI implementation, and using norm- and criterion-referenced assessments together to set cut scores and predict to high-stakes outcomes.

Screening: Screening data for the 10-11 and 11-12 school years has been collected and aggregated in the K-8 buildings of the project. These buildings all use AIMSWeb for screening and progress monitoring, which makes it possible to aggregate and compare their data. The secondary schools involved in the project, however, are using different tools for screening and progress monitoring.

Data Collection: Analysis of disaggregated data is critical when looking at general vs. special education screening data gathered thus far. At first glance, it appears as though students with disabilities populate the tier 2 and tier 3 ranks in greater proportions than those of their general education peers, and that a greater proportion of students with disabilities require more intense levels of intervention from fall to spring. This is the opposite of current expectations; however, further clarification is necessary when considering students with disabilities.

Early Childhood RtI: A partnership with the Center on RtI in Early Childhood (CRtIEC; www.crtiec.org) was developed last year. The partnership resulted in the implementation of early childhood screening and tier 2 intervention in early literacy in two Development Site schools. Teachers administered two screenings in the winter and spring, as well as a small-group tier 2 oral vocabulary intervention.

Screening and progress monitoring data collected indicate successful intervention and can be used to inform decision-making for next year. Reflecting on 11-12 screening and progress monitoring data will be very helpful for informing selection of appropriate students to participate in the intervention in 12-13. Meanwhile, analysis of screening and progress monitoring data indicate the utility of continuing this work.

Screening data from the two screens administered (Fall/Winter administered in November/December and Spring administered in April/May) indicated both successful early intervention by the two programs involved in the pilot as well as accelerated progress for students selected to participated in the intervention.

Screening results for oral comprehension, the measure called Which One Doesn't Belong, were similarly encouraging. Fall/Winter to Spring growth was more modest for students in the early childhood special education program at Site 2, but the extent to which the gap was closed for students who received tier 2 intervention remained. In the case of Site 1's at-risk population, there was more progress toward closing the gap for students who received tier 2 intervention on oral comprehension than there had been for vocabulary.

Progress monitoring data collected from students who participated in intervention showed similarly promising results. Students were tested on their abilities to provide a definition for words targeted in each unit at the beginning and end of each of the three three-week units in the intervention. Results show substantial growth in students' abilities to define the target words taught in each unit from pre- to post-test.

Higher Education Collaborative: In FY12, a project was developed to understand the extent to which RtI concepts are a focus of teacher preparation at one university. The University of Central Missouri's (UCM) teacher preparation programs agreed to participate in the project. In collaboration with UCM faculty, the coordinator developed a survey of RtI concepts that was administered to faculty. A parallel version of the survey was also developed and administered to teacher education students. Another parallel version of the survey was developed to assess schools' and districts' preferred knowledge and experience with RtI concepts. The results were analyzed to reveal relative emphases on the various concepts, as well as to see if there were any apparent gaps between reports from faculty, students, and school or district professionals.

Results of the project are preliminary, but there are two findings that will likely be reliable with more extensive data collection. The first is a pattern of emphasis across domains suggesting that there is relatively higher emphasis across groups on core curriculum and instruction, classroom environments,

and professional skills and dispositions than on universal screening, student progress monitoring, data-based decision-making and evidence-based intervention.   The second is that school and district professionals generally want a higher level of knowledge and understanding and practice in all domains than faculty and students report in programs. In other words, faculty seems to be preparing students in the right areas, but there is a gap in the depth of preparation in all areas between the programs and the hiring preferences of schools and districts.

These findings, which warrant further data collection and analysis, are consistent with anecdotal impressions of teacher preparation programs. There is a need to learn and communicate to teacher education faculty precisely what assessment, technology, instruction, and decision-making skills will be needed by teachers new to the field and to transform teacher education programs to include more clinical experience in these areas.

Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) [State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)]
Through a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funded by the U. S. Department of Education in 2007, Missouri has been researching, developing and implementing an integrated tiered process for student academic and behavioral support that acknowledges and addresses diversity in student learning. The framework for supporting this model includes 11 essential features. These features represent the evidence-based practices and qualities congruent with effective schools, RtI and successful system-change efforts. Collectively, the tiered levels of support and the essential features are integrated within the context of schools, districts and the state to form the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM). Fourteen districts representing each of the nine RPDC regions were selected to pilot this program. Districts spent 2008–09 planning and preparing and began implementation in 2009–10. In addition to continuing to implement the model in the original pilot buildings, nine of the 14 districts scaled up to additional buildings in the district during the 2010–2011 school year. The scaled-up buildings included three elementary buildings, three middle schools and five high schools. A critical element of the pilot is the evaluation of the model and its implementation. Evaluation results will inform the management team regarding any needed adaptations to the model prior to statewide scale-up. In September, 2012, the state requested and was granted a one year no cost extension for this project. During this extension year, the districts/buildings will be developing and implementing sustainability plans. The Implementation Facilitators will be continuing to work with their buildings on these plans as well as developing coaching tools based upon their experiences over the past five years. Tools, products and procedures developed as a result of this project will be finalized and refined for widespread dissemination. Information about the Missouri Integrated Model can be found at mimschools.org.

State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) 2012
In October, 2012, the state was awarded a new five-year SPDG. This SPDG will use lessons learned from the prior grant (MIM) and begin implementing a more focused school improvement process with an emphasis on Professional Development (PD) at the state, regional, district and building levels on four areas of focus: Collaborative Teams, Effective Teaching/Learning Practices, Formative Assessment, and Data-based Decision-making. Buildings with low achievement overall or with an achievement gap between all students and students with disabilities were identified throughout the state. Initially, over 200 buildings (mostly elementary buildings) volunteered to participate in the collaborative project. Middle and high schools will be added in subsequent years. With the support of technology, PD in the four focus areas will be developed and used to train state and regional staff who will in turn work with staff in the identified buildings. Building staff will form collaborative data teams that identify effective teaching/learning practices to implement in a selected area (English/Language Arts or Math). All staff will be trained in the practice. Staff will then develop and administer Common Formative Assessments to measure student progress and using a data team process, identify students for re-teaching and retesting. A cadre of purveyors will be trained to evaluate the activities of the project to ensure that all activities meet standards of High Quality Professional Development and are implemented with fidelity at all levels of the system. The overall goal of this project is improved outcomes for all students, but especially for students with disabilities.

Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech (TtS) Pilot
During 2011–12, the Enhancing Special Education (eSPED) with Technology Project continued work begun in 2006 with the eMINTS National Center as a proof-of-concept study. The project utilizes technology rich classrooms, TtS software and ongoing professional development to support and increase student achievement. The eMINTS technology rich classroom equipment minimally includes: teacher laptop and workstation; SmartBoard and projector; scanner, printer and digital camera; student computers; and specific software. Teachers participated in training in the use of the TtS software and introductory exposure to other types of assistive technology. During the 2008–09 school year, technology was upgraded in the eMINTS classrooms and the Special Education classrooms received the eMINTS technology package.

In 2011-2012 the project began a recruiting drive to get more schools to participate in the project. This recruiting project was not successful. Due to a low number of districts involved and prioritizing projects, the TtS project was discontinued at the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) Project
To address student dropout data, a comprehensive school change process that includes professional development, data-based decision-making, collaboration, action planning, and technical assistance was implemented targeting schools with a dropout rate higher than the state average (4.3% in 2008–09). In 2009–10, Missouri partnered with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) to support the implementation of effective, sustainable, and coordinated dropout prevention strategies in high schools and middle feeder schools in eight communities representative of the state (urban/rural, small/medium/large). NDPC-SD provided six days of onsite training for district personnel. NDPC-SD facilitated school's efforts using data to identify risk factors for dropout and helped identify suitable interventions to address those factors. School dropout prevention teams created action plans to be implemented during the 2010–11 school year. Data submitted during the 2010–11 school year by participant schools included retention rates, disciplinary infractions, academic failures and monthly attendance rates. The NDPC-SD also provided three one day booster sessions during the 2010–11 school year to support areas targeted in the action plans. Missouri applied for and received intensive technical assistance from the National Dropout Prevention Center for the 2011–13 school years. This will provide for the addition of new cohorts of model schools and continuing support for the model schools in cohort 1.

The cohort 1 sites have concentrated efforts toward monitoring attendance, failing grades, behavior and increasing school engagement. Preliminary data and anecdotal evidence suggest a positive impact on student performance and school policies, procedures and practices related to student retention and re-entry. Model sites continued to show progress in lowering the dropout rate. The overall decrease in dropout percentages for these sites collectively decreased by a total of 24.6% from 2008-2011. A new cohort of 7 model schools was added in the 2011-12 school year. These schools received initial training during the 2011-12 school year, collected baseline data and created action plans in targeted areas to implement during the 2012-13 school year.

The Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) consultants who work with the area of post secondary transition received training during the 2011-12 school year to provide training and support to Cohort 1 and 2 schools and to build capacity to support additional schools in the coming year.

Transition Outcomes Project (TOP)
The Transition Outcomes Project (TOP) was developed by Dr. Ed O'Leary at the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) with support from OSEP. Through implementation in 26 states, it has been shown to be an effective model for improving compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) transition requirements. It uses a data-driven decision model that:

- Identifies and evaluates current practices used to meet transition requirements.
- Includes baseline data from students' IEPs as the context for goal setting, strategy development and implementation of a local school improvement plan.

- Promotes an IEP process driven by the students' post school goals.
- Empowers local school offices of special education to make changes in systems, processes, forms, programs and approaches.

The Department contracted with Dr. O'Leary in fall 2007 to provide TOP training to Department staff, RPDC transition consultants and selected districts. The KU Transition Coalition assisted with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data was collected through the TOP training. Since the 2008-2009 school year a total of 169 schools have received TOP training.

Each year, Regional Professional Development Centers provide TOP training to participating districts in varying stages of implementation. This training includes assisting district teams in conducting IEP reviews, analyzing results, reporting Indicator 13 data to district staff, developing and implementing action plans, and conducting follow-up IEP reviews. Additional districts will be added during each school year with the goal of having all districts in the state trained and implementing the TOP.

As a part of the TOP, Missouri also utilizes the web-based CuttingEdj database. This website allows educators to review and track IEPs for compliance with Indicator 13. It allows districts to see the number of files that do or do not meet Indicator 13 guidelines. It also allows for the tracking of corrections made to files which are out of compliance and identifies systemic problems and issues. It allows for the identification of the strategies and action steps IEP teams have taken for improvement. It also disaggregates data and allows for the tracking of data over time.

Training/Professional Development/Technical Assistance

RPDC Consultants
The Department contracts with nine RPDCs across Missouri to provide training and technical assistance to districts through the support of the following consultant positions:

- Twenty (20) improvement consultants facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data-based school improvement plans. They align, coordinate, and deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide ongoing coaching related to implementing school improvement plans
- Twenty-four (24) SW-PBS consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district SW-PBS coaches/facilitators and otherwise support districts in implementation of SW-PBS.
- Six (6) compliance consultants work with districts to understand compliance requirements, provide training, conduct self-reviews and assist with writing and implementing corrective action plans.
- Three (3) blindness skills specialists consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.
- Twenty-four (24) PLC consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PLC implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor building/district PLC coaches/facilitators and otherwise support buildings/districts in implementation of PLC.

Throughout the remainder of the document, these personnel at the RPDCs will collectively be called "RPDC consultants" or "consultants."

Project ACCESS
Created in 1985, Project Access was one of the first state resource centers for autism in the nation. Project ACCESS at Missouri State University, funded 100% by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, provides autism resource information to public schools across Missouri serving students with autism and other pervasive developmental disorders (PDD) in the form of on-site and telephone consultations, as well as support via the internet.

In addition, Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and credentials individuals to present these courses through Missouri's Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs). These trainings are offered to Missouri school district staff and educators who work with individuals aged 0–21 who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and related disabilities. Onsite child specific consultations can be arranged through the use of Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and district staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs). Forty-six (46) new IDACs were trained by Project ACCESS credentialed staff.

As part of the Building Effective Autism Teams (BEAT) initiative, which is designed to increase local capacity for serving students with ASD, Project ACCESS assigned BEAT coaches to participating districts throughout Missouri and coaches were chosen to aid specific districts based on Project ACCESS criteria. Twenty-one school districts were served through BEAT coaches during the 2011–12 year, with 109 school visits conducted.

The Project ACCESS website (education.missouristate.edu/access/) had 114,209 page views from 12,878 unique users with 28% new visitors and over 71% returning throughout the 2011–12 year. In addition, four webinars throughout the year were held regarding ASD. Participants in the webinars reported positive feedback including verification of receiving ideas and resources that would assist them in serving ASD students in their daily work.

Missouri Resources (MORE)
The Department, in conjunction with the NCRRC, supports the Missouri Resources (MORE) web-based system. This system provides SPP indicator-related information on multiple topics:

- Academic Achievement
- Disproportionality
- Dispute Resolution
- Dropout
- Early Childhood Outcomes
- Early Intervening Services (EIS)

- Graduation
- LRE (preschool- and school-age)
- Parent Involvement
- Post-secondary Transition
- Suspension and Expulsion
- Three-Tiered Models of Intervention (RtI)

Within each of the topics, information in the following areas can be accessed: Literature, Position Statement, Evidence-Based Practice, Online Resource and Definition. This system has been revised and updated during the 2011-2012 school year to enhance the use of the web site. The site will be reintroduced in 2012-2013 as "TheSource" and remarketed to the public. The revisions include adding a survey for MORE users to provide feedback on the usefulness and quality of the site and its resources. The site can be seen at http://thesource.northcentralrrc.org/.

Standards-Based Individualized Education Program (IEP)
The Standards-Based Individualized Education Program (IEP) training is a one-day (six-hour) training session for delivery to IEP teams. This training is conducted at least once annually in each region using the Standards-Based IEP training module. This module was developed collaboratively by the NCRRC, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC), staff from three Missouri RPDCs and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Project Forum. The training was vetted by Department personnel. This Standards-Based IEP training takes the participant through the steps of a planning process that improves the development of the IEP and helps the IEP team participants recognize the importance of connecting instructional goals to the general curriculum and grade-level standards. During the 2011–12 school year, RPDC consultants held seven standards-based IEP trainings across the state with a total of 86 participants. The OSE is currently in the process of updating this module to align with the Missouri Core Academic Standards.

Evaluation

SPP Improvement Activity Evaluation
The OSE began work with the NCRRC in November 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the

implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained OSE staff in an improvement activity evaluation model. Using this model, OSE staff has worked to review and revise all existing improvement activities, align the activities with all contractual activities and develop action plans with implementation and impact measures for every activity. Work on the evaluation plans and implementation measures continued during the 2011–12 school year. In May 2012, NCRRC staff provided both Part B and Part C staff with additional training and technical assistance on SPP and APR development and SPP improvement activity selection and evaluation. Detailed action plans and evaluation measures may be found at dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html.

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	81.2% graduation rate for students with disabilities
2011-12	70.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

The graduation rate data reported below are the data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Per instructions for the APR in the Measurement Table, 2010-11 data is reported; however, in order to align with the data reported for the 2011-12 CSPR, 2011-12 data are also reported.

Missouri Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate Data			
Year	Number of Four-Year Graduates with IEPs	Special Education Adjusted Cohort	**Graduation Rate**
2010-11	6,818	9,944	**68.6%**
2011-12	5,876	8,068	**72.8%**

Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate = (Number of graduates within four years with IEPs / Number in Special Education cohort) x 100

Missouri Five-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate Data			
Year	Number of Five-Year Graduates with IEPs	Special Education Adjusted Cohort	Graduation Rate
2010-11	7,341	9,824	74.7%

Five-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate = (Number of graduates within five years with IEPs / Number in Special Education cohort) x 100

Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEP.

The State of Missouri has developed guidelines for graduation requirements for students in Missouri's public schools. These guidelines include policy considerations for students with disabilities served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Those guidelines include the following provisions:
- Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years.
- Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner within the spirit and intent of that requirement as follows:

1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a student with a disability if recommended by the student's IEP team.
2. Students with disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcripted in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.
3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs will receive grades and have credit transcripted in the same manner as students who complete the courses without modification. The fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcript.

- Students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation credit requirements by taking and passing regular courses, taking and passing regular courses with modification, taking and passing modified classes, or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.
- Students with disabilities who reach age twenty-one (21), or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

Missouri is reporting the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the first time with the 2010-11 data. With a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 68.6%, Missouri did not meet the target of 81.2%; however, that target was established based on the previous calculation, so is not a valid comparison. Using 2011-12 data as the baseline, targets have been revised in the SPP to reflect this calculation change and to align with Missouri's approved ESEA Flexibility Application. Missouri's 2011-12 graduation rate of 72.8% exceeds the revised target of 70.0%.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Manage and support the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) in order to establish a collaborative interagency group which will develop and oversee the implementation of a coordinated state-wide plan for post secondary transition programs and services.
- Manage/support a Missouri transition Community of Practice (CoP) to provide educators the opportunity to share best practices, access experts in the field, and interact with other educators throughout the state.
- Recruit districts within RPDC region to participate in the Missouri Option Program.
- Recruit and support transition liaisons in all RPDC regions to increase state capacity to provide training and information in the area of post secondary transition.
- Recruit and support Community Transition Teams (CTTs) in all RPDC regions to assist in the identification of local, regional and state resources to support the development and implementation of best practices.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants on post secondary transition.
- Support scale-up of the Transition-to-College Program to assist students with disabilities in accessing and succeeding in post-secondary education.
- Support scale-up of National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) program to additional districts in the state.

- Recruit, train and support local districts in the implementation of Check and Connec**t.**
- Certify RPDC consultants as Check and Connect trainers to provide training and technical assistance to LEAs.

Discussion of Improvement Activities

Manage and Support the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT): The MITT was formed in 2007 to increase interagency collaboration at the state, regional and local levels. For the past five years, the MITT has met quarterly to address data-driven goals for improvement and collaboration with the shared vision of improving employment, independent living and postsecondary education outcomes for Missouri students with disabilities.

Consisting of a diverse membership from a variety of state agencies concerned with transition, the MITT provides a venue to share information, network, and partner to coordinate professional development activities. The membership of the MITT is an evolving process with new members added on an as needed basis. At this time the membership of the MITT consists of Missouri Parents Act (MPACT); higher education; Department of Mental Health (DMH); RPDCs; DESE Office of Special Education including Sheltered Workshops, Compliance and Effective Practices; Department of Corrections; Department of Economic Development; DESE Office of College and Career Readiness including Guidance and Counseling; DESE Office of Adult Learning and Rehabilitation Services including Adult Education and Vocational Rehabilitation; Centers for Independent Living; The Governor's Council on Disabilities; Missouri Developmental Disabilities Council and the Children's Division of Family Services.

During the 2011-12 school year, the MITT focused on integrating the Missouri Core Academic Standards into transition initiatives and the identification of services provided by each agency to facilitate discussion and planning to address the needs and gaps in services statewide. In addition members of the MITT attended and participated in the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center's (NSTTAC) Capacity Building Institute in May of 2012. During this time, current activities in the area of transition were evaluated and a plan developed for the coming year. The MITT also supports the work of transition by collaborating to provide shared transition trainings, providing individual agency direct training to local community transition teams, and attending and presenting critical transition information as a part of other statewide transition trainings.

Manage/Support a Community of Practice: The Missouri Transition Community of Practice (MO CoP) at missouritransition.org is a website designed to increase collaboration and information-sharing among transition professionals and consultants across Missouri. This website includes information on upcoming events, resources, links to other websites, discussion forums and features events such as "Ask the Expert." Currently, 800 Missouri transition professionals are members of the MO CoP. Professionals can create a free account on this website to access information and discussions. The discussion forums were viewed a total of 2,131 times by 91 users for the period of July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012. The main features of the MO CoP include:

- **Calendar:** Transition trainings and events occurring throughout the state are posted on the calendar.
- **News:** Announcements regarding training, Ask the Expert events, and the Summer Institute as well as other events are shared through the news section of MO CoP. Each person enrolled in the MO CoP automatically receives an email message of any news items that are posted. During the 2011-12 school year, 20 news items were posted to the site.
- **Discussion Forums:** Fourteen discussion forums are listed on the MO CoP covering topics such as employment, independent living, compliance, assessment, etc. Any participant using the website can post questions, comments or replies on any of the forums.
- **Ask the Expert:** Events consist of information and discussion facilitated by an identified expert on a particular topic over a specified period of time. Participants can post questions or comments and view the questions and responses of others participating in the discussion. The three Ask the

Expert event topics for the 2011-12 year were identified to correspond with the year's training priority of employment. The Ask the Expert events were:

Creating a seamless System of Dropout Prevention (November 4–December 12, 2011) Stacey Tracey, Special Education Director, Neosho R-5 School District. A total of 81 individual users logged in during this event with a total of 226 views. Of those who completed a post event survey, 100% of those individuals indicated they would use this information in their own schools.

Check and Connect: Increasing Student Engagement (January 9–20, 2012) Kay Augustine, Check and Connect Project, University of Minnesota and Larry Williams, Willow Springs R-IV School District. A total of 64 individual users logged on for this event with a total of 603 total views. All respondents who completed a post event survey indicated they would utilize this information in their schools.

Transition Planning Toolkit: Collaborative Activities and Resources (February 20–March 20, 2012) Brenda Simmons and Tonya Fambro, DESE Office of Adult Learning and Rehabilitation Services, Vocational Rehabilitation (authors of the toolkit). There were a total of 64 users logged in for this event with a total of 326 views. All respondents who completed the post event survey indicated they would use this information in their schools.

Recruit Districts within RPDC Region to Participate in the Missouri Option Program: The Missouri Option Program is designed to target students who could complete Missouri high school graduation requirements but for a variety of reasons lack the credits needed to graduate with their class and are at risk of leaving school without a high school diploma. The program specifically targets those students who are 17 years of age or older and are at least one year behind their cohort group or for other significant reasons that are identified in the local Missouri Option Program Plan. Currently there are 230 schools participating in the Missouri Option Program. This represents 40% of all Missouri districts. In the 2012 school year, there were 75 IEP students (or 1.1% of IEP graduates) who graduated as a part of the Missouri Option Program. The Office of Quality Schools and the Office of Special Education have collaborated to create a marketing plan to send to Missouri schools which details the Missouri Option Program.

Recruit and Support Transition Liaisons: The Missouri Transition Liaison Program began in 2007 in order to improve transition education and services in Missouri by supporting local-level leaders in transition education and services. In 2011–12, there were 22 Missouri Transition Liaisons, including ten original members. In summer 2011, five new Missouri Transition Liaisons were selected based on a competitive application process.

In the 2011-12 school year, Missouri Transition Liaisons attended one face-to-face professional development session in Columbia, Missouri. They also had two webinars which were held in the spring and fall of the year. The role of the liaisons is to increase their knowledge about transition activities for students within their local and surrounding districts through formal presentations, collaboration, and exchanging ideas and resources. In addition to receiving professional development and technical assistance, Missouri Transition Liaisons partnered with the Department to assist with activities at the Missouri Summer Transition Institute. They also reviewed materials and resources prior to state-wide dissemination. The liaisons were also charged with reaching out to districts in their area who had not attended a formal professional development event in the area of transition. There were 113 districts that did not participate in state or RPDC transition professional development in the 2007-2012 school years. As a result of liaison outreach, 24 (or 21%) of these districts participated in transition professional development in the 2011-12 school year. There were nine who participated in RPDC trainings, six in the DESE Transition Institute, two in TOPs, two in the transition self study, two in the spring Facilitating Family Involvement workshop and one as a part of the CTT.

Missouri Transition Liaisons also disseminated other information about transition at the local level. Dissemination methods included email correspondence, face-to-face trainings, meetings, website

postings, and newsletters with information, resources and tools related to transition. Additional methods included articles in local newspapers, school bulletin boards, flyers sent home to parents, hand-delivered resources to school personnel and informal conversations with staff.

Recruit and Support Community Transition Teams (CTT): From 2008 to 2012, the Department and the Transition Coalition partnered to develop 36 CTTs across Missouri. The goals of the CTTs are to:

- Provide an understanding of transition planning, services and research-based effective practices in transition as a framework for educators, students, families, administrators, interagency personnel, community partners and employers to ensure that they have the necessary knowledge and tools to improve postsecondary outcomes;
- Provide training in developing a strategic plan for community-wide transition systems;
- Improve access to employment opportunities and other post-school activities as defined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and
- Elevate community awareness of, and commitment to, improving student outcomes.

In March 2011, 36 CTTs from four cohorts completed the Community Transition Team Outreach Assessment, providing quantitative data and listing activities and products developed by the team. The CTTs reported that their team activities focused primarily on students and parents/caregivers. Examples of some tools and resources developed by the CTTs impacting their local community were:

- Local or regional transition fairs, often in partnership with the RPDCs;
- Resource directories and brochures;
- School Board presentations, newspaper releases, presentations at school or community meetings, and networking at social events to increase awareness of CTT activities and purpose;
- Informational meetings for students and parents;
- School and community newsletters;
- New transition programs within the school setting;
- Professional development trainings within the district or in partnership with RPDCs and agency representatives;
- CTT information on the district website or the city/community website;
- Public service announcements on the local radio station; and
- Daily school bulletin posts on transition-related initiatives.

In the summer of 2011, ten teams were selected through a competitive process to participate in the Cohort IV Missouri CTT training. School personnel submitted the application and recruited additional members to create a six-person core team to attend three two-day training sessions (fall, winter and spring) in Jefferson City. Membership included school personnel, Vocational Rehabilitation counselors, parents, DMH case managers, RPDC consultants, Missouri Protection and Advocacy (P&A) representatives, employers and a variety of adult service providers from their communities. Team membership was individualized based on the services available and needs within their community. The ten Cohort IV (2011–2012) CTTs received ongoing professional development focused on self-assessment and analysis of local needs, membership analysis, team names, goals and vision statements. Action plans and goals were developed and updated on an ongoing basis during each session. Over the three training sessions, 12 guest speakers from a variety of Missouri adult service agencies provided an overview of their programs and information specific to the mission of their organizations. Varying degrees of training were provided to the other 26 teams including face-to-face trainings and webinars.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: Performance data by district and region is provided annually to the RPDC Consultants to enable them to identify and provide technical assistance and professional development to districts in order to improve performance in areas of need. Using the data, consultants target districts for technical assistance. Consultant logs indicate a total of 568 visits to 253 districts identified by the RPDCs as needing targeted technical assistance on this indicator.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See the APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Recruit and Develop "Models of Success" in Post Secondary Transition: Models of Success are local-level transition practices that have been proven to be effective in Missouri schools. According to Google Analytics, during the period of time from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012, the main page of Models of Success was viewed 2,308 times by 1,420 individual users. This data includes anyone who visited this page during the year, not just Missouri residents. The following method was utilized for the identification of Models of Success:

> Solicitation: Submission forms were disseminated at face-to-face conferences, meetings, etc. by Transition Coalition, RPDC, and Department staff. Submission forms were posted on the MO CoP and emails with information and the application were sent on SELS and the MO CoP. The online submission form was available on transitioncoalition.org.

> Review: Transition Coalition staff reviewed the submissions using a rubric. They followed up with the applicants to develop detailed descriptions. A summary of each submission and the results of the review process, as well as the programs/practices that were recommended for development online, were provided to the Department for final approval.

> Development: Transition Coalition staff worked with Models of Success to finalize descriptions and materials for posting to Models of Success page of transitioncoalition.org. Transition Coalition staff followed up with contacts for each Model of Success annually to update their information and to ensure it was still in place.

> Dissemination: Identified Models of Success were highlighted at appropriate face-to-face trainings, conferences and online events in Missouri. RPDC consultants and transition liaisons were informed of the Models of Success so that they may use them as examples in appropriate training sessions they provide. A link to the Models of Success page was provided on the MO CoP at missouritransition.org.

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants on Post Secondary Transition: Through a collaborative effort between the Department and the KU Transition Coalition, three online independent-study training modules have been developed for transition professionals in Missouri. They include case studies, performance-based assessments, and resources on transition compliance, best practices and transition assessment. The modules are available at no cost on the Transition Coalition website. *The Best Practices in Transition Planning* module was released in spring 2009, *Transition Assessment: The Big Picture* module in spring 2010, *Student Engagement and Self-determination* module in spring 2011, *Employment Outcomes* in spring 2011 and *Facilitating Family Engagement in Transition* in 2012. A total of 170 transition professionals attended the Facilitating Family Engagement in Transition training. This workshop provided information, strategies, and learning activities pertaining to listening to families, inviting involvement, facilitating participation in IEP meetings and collaboratively implementing the IEP. Of the 170 transition professionals, 121 completed a pre-post questionnaire. Significant gains in understanding were noted in all areas with gains of 1.10 to 1.98 points. RPDC consultants provide ongoing professional development and technical assistance to teachers and school teams within each region of Missouri. All school districts have access to a RPDC consultant specializing in transition.

Over the past four years, five transition workshop packages have been developed for RPDC consultants. Incorporating a train-the-trainer model, consultants provided input into the training topic and materials, observed the training being conducted, discussed adaptations to the training, and then provided the training within their regions. These packages were: Transition Compliance and Form C, Transition Assessment, Interagency Collaboration, Summary of Performance, Student Engagement and Self-determination, and Enhancing Employment Outcomes. The consultants provided 93 trainings on these

packages during the 2011-12 school year with a total of 1,386 participants. The consultants also have access to an online community of practice for in-depth discussions and to share resources.

Transition-to-College Program: In 2009, the College of Education at Southeast Missouri State University (SEMO) and the Southeast RPDC collaborated to offer students with disabilities who plan to attend either the SEMO campus or a regional campus to have the opportunity to experience what college is like prior to the beginning of classes. The focus is on making a successful transition from high school to college via a two-day/one-night experience that incorporates becoming acquainted with various on-campus services. Those services include the Learning Assistance Programs and Disability Support Services Office, the campus shuttle, the university counseling center and others. Students participating in the program also meet with a panel of students with disabilities who share experiences about campus life. The Office of Special Education offered training on this program to the RPDC transition consultants in 2010, and the Department budgeted for this to be replicated at the other RPDCs across the state.

In the 2010-11 school year, SEMO had nine participants in this program. In the 2011-12 school year, five of them continued their education on the SEMO campus, one moved and continued their education at another campus, one moved and did not continue and one dropped out. The University of Missouri - Columbia campus did an initial year of transition to college in the 2011-12 school year with five students.

National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD): In 2008–09, through an extensive needs assessment and data analysis, the MITT identified the common statewide need for dropout prevention of students both with and without disabilities. An interdepartmental effort began in 2009 to address the problem of dropout in Missouri. In the fall of 2009, Missouri signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishing a partnership with the NDPC-SD. NDPC-SD was established in January 2004 to support states in assisting Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to increase school completion rates and decrease dropout rates among students with disabilities. NDPC-SD is funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and is part of OSEP's Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network designed to support the national implementation of provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

The NDPC-SD provides training and technical assistance to decrease dropout rates in Missouri schools. Efforts are directed at the school-level rather than district-level. The selection process identified schools already selected by the Office of College and Career Readiness to participate in a statewide Dropout Summit. A total of 42 high schools and their feeder middle schools were invited to apply to become part of the project intended to impact all students, both with and without disabilities. Eight schools were chosen from three geographic areas around the state, one urban, one rural and one consortium of six high schools in Southwest Missouri. In the 2011-12 school year a second cohort of Model Schools was added which included seven additional schools. These schools received training from the NDPC-SD during the 2011-12 school year. They attended the first Missouri Dropout Prevention Summit in Jefferson City and the NDPC-SD Dropout Summit in Baltimore.

During the past year, the Department developed an online database for pilot schools to upload data on a regular basis. This data includes discipline referrals, academic achievement, attendance, and other information critical to identifying school-wide areas for improvement. Also, the Department collected action plans from the pilot schools in order to track progress and plan technical assistance and support for staff from the pilot schools. The Missouri pilot schools presented at the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center Conference and at the 2012 Dropout Summit. Initial data show that Cohort 1 schools are increasing graduation rates and reducing dropout rates for students with disabilities. All schools received follow-up technical assistance and professional development from the NDPC-SD during the 2011-12 school year. In addition, in August 2011, Missouri applied for and received an intensive technical assistance grant from the NDPC-SD which was used to support the Missouri dropout initiative. The RPDC Consultants were trained as part of the train-the-trainer model during June of 2012. This will allow for them to support existing model schools and to participate in the addition of new cohorts. Missouri is the first state to be part of the train-the-trainer model for the NDPC-SD.

Check and Connect: In the 2011-12 school year, Missouri entered into a partnership with the University of Minnesota to bring Check and Connect Training to Missouri. Check and Connect is a comprehensive intervention designed to enhance student engagement at school and with learning for marginalized, disengaged students in grades K-12, through relationship building, problem solving and capacity building, and persistence. A goal of Check and Connect is to foster school completion with academic and social competence. A total of 79 schools received Check and Connect Training during the school year. Since this was the initial year, Missouri does not yet have data to provide for Check and Connect.

Check and Connect Train the Trainer: Missouri was the first state to have certified Check and Connect Trainers. The RPDC consultants were trained by the University of Minnesota to become Check and Connect Trainers during June of 2012. This certification allows for the consultants to train schools who wish to receive Check and Connect training as well as provide ongoing support. This certification is good for a period of two years.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities. Two additional improvement activities regarding dropout prevention and Missouri Connections have been added to the SPP. Targets for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years have been revised in the SPP due to implementation of the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (which results in a lower graduation rate than the previous calculation) and to reflect the targets established in Missouri's approved ESEA Flexibility Application.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

DESE Response
The state has reported the same data used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	4.8% dropout rate for students with disabilities
2011-12	4.8% dropout rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

Per instructions for the APR, 2010-11 data is reported for this 2011-12 APR, however Missouri has opted to include data for 2011-12 as well. For this APR, states were allowed the flexibility to report the dropout rate defined in the measurement table (see above) or report using the same data source and measurement that the state used for its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012. Missouri is reporting the dropout rate calculation used in the previous APR because this is the same calculation used for all students.

Year	Number of Dropouts with IEPs in Grades 9-12	Number of IEP Students in Grades 9-12	Dropout Rate
2007-08	1,874	38,016	4.9%
2008-09	1,861	37,292	5.0%
2009-10	1,518	36,326	4.2%
2010-11	1,436	35,284	**4.1%**
2011-12	1,341	33,698	**4.0%**

Dropout Rate = Number of dropouts with IEPs in grades 9-12 / Number of IEP students in grades 9-12

A dropout is an individual who:

1. Was enrolled at the end of the previous school year, did not return to school after summer vacation and was not enrolled at any time during the school year, or
2. Was enrolled during the regular school term and was not enrolled on the last day of that same school term; and
3. Has not graduated from high school; and
4. Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
   a. Transferred to another public school, nonpublic school, home school; or
   b. Temporary absence due to suspension or verified illness; or
   c. Death; or
   d. Reenrolled on or before the enrollment count date of the following September.

This definition applies to all students, including students with disabilities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

With a 4.1% dropout rate for 2010-11 and 4.0% for 2011-12, the state met the targets of 4.8% for both years and noted a continued decrease in the dropout rate from previous years moving from 4.9% in 2007 to 4.0% in 2012. These gains are attributed, in part, to improvement in five districts that are receiving technical assistance from the NDPC-SD. These five districts had a combined dropout rate of 31.67% in 2007-08. After three years of technical assistance from NDPC-SD, these districts now have a combined dropout rate of 13.14% for the 2011-12 year. An additional cohort of seven schools was added in the 2011-12 school year. There is no progress data yet available on these districts. See Indicator 1 for information on improvement activities completed.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

See Indicator 1 for Improvement Activities.

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities. Two additional improvement activities regarding dropout prevention and Missouri Connections have been added to the SPP. Since Missouri is using the same dropout rate calculation as in previous APRs, the state is not resetting the baseline and is not reestablishing targets.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table
OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:
   A.   Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup
   B.   Participation rate for children with IEPs
   C.   Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:
A. AMO percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AMO targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.
B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	A. Percent of districts meeting AMO: 37% B. Participation rate for children with IEPs: CA - 95% Math - 95% C. Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA - 56.2% Math - 56.4%

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

At 0.6%, the state did not meet the target for 3A Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) of 37%.

At 99.4% for communication arts (CA) and mathematics (Math), the state met the 2011-12 target of 95% for indicator 3B (participation).

At 27.4% for CA and 29.8% for Math, the state did not meet the targets for 3C (proficiency) of 56.2% for CA and 56.4% for Math.

The current statewide assessment program is composed of grade level assessments for grades 3-8. Prior to the 2008-09 school year, at the high school level, CA was assessed at grade 11 and Math was assessed at grade 10.

Beginning in 2008-09, the following required End of Course (EOC) assessments were administered at the secondary level in place of the MAP: Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Government was administered as a required EOC assessment beginning in 2009-10.

In June 2012, Missouri was notified that the ESEA Flexibility had been approved. Due to the approval, Missouri did not calculate Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for districts or schools based on 2011-12 data. Therefore, the data reported for Indicator 3A is based on AMO rather than AYP.

Public Reporting Information:
Public reports of assessment data are available online at
   mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx and
   dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/Assessment.pdf

A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size that meet the state's AMO targets for the disability subgroup.

The AMO proficiency goals for 2011-12 were 56.2% for communication arts and 56.4% for mathematics.

Districts Meeting AMO Targets in Disability Subgroup				
Year	Subject	Districts MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup*	**Percent Met for IEP Subgroup**
2011-12	Communication Arts	3	319	0.9%
	Mathematics	2	321	0.6%
	Combined – CA & Math	2	330	**0.6%**

* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for was 30

B. Participation Rate for Children with IEPs

MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities				
	Total Students with Disabilities	Regular MAP Assessment Participation	MAP-Alternate Assessment Participation	**Participation Rate**
2006-07 Communication Arts	69,622	65,083	4,090	99.4%
2006-07 Mathematics	71,069	66,479	4,103	99.3%
2007-08 Communication Arts	66,425	61,469	4,717	99.6%
2007-08 Mathematics	67,754	62,636	4,826	99.6%
2008-09 Communication Arts	67,124	61,629	5,264	99.7%
2008-09 Mathematics	66,179	60,680	5,251	99.6%
2009-10 Communication Arts	64,827	58,882	5,761	99.7%
2009-10 Mathematics	64,565	58,534	5,801	99.6%
2010-11 Communication Arts	63,013	56,614	5,967	99.3%
2010-11 Mathematics	63,369	56,843	6,006	99.2%
2011-12 Communication Arts	62,528	55,960	6,204	**99.4%**
2011-12 Mathematics	62,499	55,789	6,304	**99.4%**

Source: State assessment data for all students with disabilities in all grade levels assessed, including students not participating in assessments and students not enrolled for a full academic year. Participation Rate = ((Regular MAP Assessment Participation + MAP-Alternate Assessment Participation) / Total Students with Disabilities) x 100

The number of students with disabilities tested differs in Communication Arts and Mathematics primarily due testing at the high school level where End-of-Course exams and alternate assessments are administered at different courses and/or grade levels. Students are required to take End-of-Course exams for Algebra I and English II, so different students, and therefore different numbers of students are assessed in the two content areas. High School alternate assessments are administered for Mathematics at grade 10 and Communication Arts at grade 11. Small differences are also due to students who may have taken the assessment in one content area but were absent for the other content area.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

"Proficiency" includes the top two of four achievement levels, proficient and advanced, on the regular MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments.

MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities			
	Total	Proficient or Advanced	**Proficiency Rate**
2011-12 Communication Arts Total	62,164	17,014	**27.4%**
2011-12 Mathematics Total	62,093	18,478	**29.8%**

Source: State Assessment data

The number of students with disabilities tested differs in Communication Arts and Mathematics primarily due to testing at the high school level where End-of-Course exams and alternate assessments are administered at different courses and/or grade levels. Students are required to take End-of-Course exams for Algebra I and English II, so different students, and therefore different numbers of students are assessed in the two content areas. High School alternate assessments are administered for Mathematics at grade 10 and Communication Arts at grade 11. Small differences are also due to students who may have taken the assessment in one content area but were absent for the other content area.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

With this 2011-12 APR, Missouri changed from reporting on percent of districts meeting AYP to percent of districts meeting AMO's. This is due to the US Department of Education approving Missouri's ESEA Flexibility request. There were multiple ways to meet AYP (confidence intervals, safe harbor, growth, etc.), but AMO is determined solely by the percent of students meeting the proficiency target. The limitations of a single direct calculation and the terms of the flexibility request establishing the same level of proficiency for all students regardless of the existing proficiency gap significantly contributes to the difficulty districts face in trying to meet the AMO and for the state to meet the indicator. Missouri would appreciate OSEP allowing states to establish targets that are challenging but achievable for students with disabilities that are aligned with, but not identical to, the AMOs for all students.

The state met the target for Indicator 3B and continues to maintain very high participation rates for students with disabilities.

The state did not meet the proficiency targets established for Indicator 3C for 2010-11 which are those established in Missouri's ESEA Flexibility request. While the targets were not met, the state did see some progress in the percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or advanced.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Support the eMINTS TtS project to assist students with print disabilities to achieve higher levels of performance in Communication Arts.
- Develop and pilot an integrated three-tiered support system which will provide districts a means to integrate all of the components of effective three-tiered models which address the academic and behavioral needs of all students.
- Provide information to various stakeholders on three-tiered models of student support.
- Provide training/professional development to districts through the RPDC Consultants on three-tiered models of student support.
- Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).
- Support, through Project ACCESS, the development of services and programs to increase school district capacity to serve students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).

- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants on accommodations and modifications to improve the achievement of students with disabilities.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans

Improvement Activity Discussion

Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech Project: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech (TtS)."

Develop and Pilot an Integrated Three-Tiered Support System: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) [State Personnel Development Grant]."

Provide Information to Various Stakeholders on Three Tiered Models of Student Support. See APR Overview under the categories labeled "Response to Intervention (RtI)", "Missouri Integrated Model (MIM)", and "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)."

Provide Training/Professional Development to Districts through the RPDC Consultants on Three-tiered models of student support): See APR Overview under the categories labeled "Response to Intervention (RtI)", "Missouri Integrated Model (MIM)", and "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)."

Support the Implementation of a Statewide System of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)."

Support, through Project ACCESS, the Development of Services and Programs to Increase School District Capacity to Serve Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Project ACCESS."

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants on Accommodations and Modifications to Improve the Achievement of Students with Disabilities: Dissemination of trainings on accommodations and modifications are accomplished through the work of the regional special education consultants described in the overview category labeled "RPDC Consultants."

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: The Office of Special Education makes data available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on a regular basis. These data, which include data on state assessments, are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions requiring training and technical assistance. Once districts are identified, regional school improvement teams work with those districts to develop and implement an improvement plan specific to district needs. These plans include a needs assessment based upon data analysis, coaching, technical assistance and provision of professional development to district staff.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under categories labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)" and "RPDC Consultants."

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants for Development and Implementation of Improvement Plans: The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for state assessment performance targets complete an improvement plan to address areas in need of improvement. Districts

completing improvement plans analyze assessment data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, address it through an objective and strategies.

In addition to the improvement planning component of the self-assessment process, districts can apply for competitive grants in the area of elementary achievement through the development of an improvement plan. See the APR Overview for more information on the activities implemented by grant recipients under the category labeled "Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants".

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that revisions were necessary. Three improvement activities were reworded to provide clarity. One improvement activity regarding improvement planning is being removed from the SPP due to the Office of Special Education removing the requirement for a separate Special Education Improvement Plan and aligning expectations with Department requirements to incorporate all district improvement activities in the District's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). Targets for Indicator 3C have been revised in the SPP due to Missouri being granted ESEA Flexibility in June 2012.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table
OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:
   A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
   B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:
A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	A. 0.5% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates B. 0% of districts have significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, in suspension/expulsion rates; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the discrepancies that are not in compliance

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

Per OSEP's instructions, 2010-11 data for 4A and 4B are being used for this APR.

For Indicator 4A, with 0.2% of districts identified with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates, the state met the established target of 0.5% of districts identified based on data from 2009-10 and 2010-11.

For indicator 4B, with 1.6% of districts with policies, procedures or practices that contributed to significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity in suspension/expulsion rates, the state did not meet the established target of 0%.

States must look at discrepancies either:

   A. In suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities BETWEEN districts
      • Compare District X's rate to District Y's rate
   B. In suspension/expulsion rates for students with and without disabilities WITHIN districts
      • Compare District X's rates for students with disabilities to District X's rates for nondisabled students

The Department uses Method B.

Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident.

INDICATOR 4A

For each district with at least ten discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (Number of incidents for non-disabled students / enrollment)

The cut point used for Indicator 4A is 4.0.

Once the preliminary list of districts is determined, other factors are taken into account to finalize the list of districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines these factors:

4A: Discipline Summary Based on 2010-11 Data	
Total LEAs in state	563
Districts with ten or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	58
Districts excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum incident count (of the 505 excluded, 313 reported no long-term out-of-school removals)	505
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0	7
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates*	5
Districts with second year of identification **(significant discrepancy)**	1
Percent of districts with significant discrepancies	**0.2%**

Source: Discipline Incident Data from MOSIS Discipline Incidents
file (Table 5 of Information Collection 1820–1621)

*"Not low discipline rates" indicates that students with disabilities had a discipline rate less than two incidents per hundred students and non-disabled students had a discipline rate less than one incident per hundred students. When computing a ratio from these low discipline rates, the results are often very skewed; however, the rates indicate that the districts are not excessively or routinely removing students from the classroom for discipline purposes.

INDICATOR 4B

For each district with at least ten discipline incidents for students with disabilities in a racial/ethnic group, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities in the racial/ethnic group (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students of all racial/ethnic groups (Number of incidents for non-disabled students / enrollment)

The cut point used for Indicator 4B for each racial/ethnic group is 4.0.

Once the preliminary list of districts is determined, other factors are taken into account to finalize the list of districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines these factors:

4B: Discipline Summary Based on 2010-11 Data					
	Black	**White**	**Hispanic**	**Multi-Racial**	**Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander**
Total number of districts	563	563	563	563	563
Districts with ten or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	32	36	1	1	0
Districts excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum incident count	531 (of which 473 had no reported incidents)	527 (of which 340 had no reported incidents)	562 (of which 536 had no reported incidents)	562 (of which 539 had no reported incidents)	563 (of which 548 had no reported incidents)
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0	14	1	0	1	0
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates*	14	1	0	1	0
(a) Districts with second year of identification **(significant discrepancy)**	9	0	0	0	0
(b) Districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, and use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	9	0	0	0	0
(b) as a percent of districts	**1.6%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**

Source: Discipline Incident Data from MOSIS Discipline Incidents file

Unduplicated districts excluded from calculations: based on the table above a total of 52 districts met the minimum "n" size for one or more racial/ethnic categories. This resulted in 511 (563 – 52) unduplicated districts excluded from calculations.

*"Not low discipline rates" indicates that students with disabilities had a discipline rate less than two incidents per hundred students and non-disabled students had a discipline rate less than one incident per hundred students. When computing a ratio from these low discipline rates, the results are often very skewed; however, the rates indicate that the districts are not excessively or routinely removing students from the classroom for discipline purposes.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

For the 2010-11 school year (based on 2009-10 and 2010-11 data), one district (0.2% of districts) was identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for Indicator 4A, resulting in the state meeting the Indicator 4A target for the percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The monitoring review of this one district with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities indicated that the discrepancy was a result of policies, procedures or practices that did not comply with requirements relating to the

development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards. The review process consisted of a self-assessment and review of policies, procedures and practices by the identified district with phone monitoring for verification of data. In addition, a review of student files was completed in the area of discipline with a desk audit to verify results. Two findings were made related to inappropriate discipline procedures. The district provided documentation of correction of individual noncompliance as well as a follow-up sample of student files demonstrating correction of the identified noncompliance within the twelve month timeframe for correction of noncompliance allowed for by the IDEA.

For Indicator 4B, the Department identified nine districts (based on data from 2009-10 and 2010-11) as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. These nine districts were reviewed using the same monitoring procedures as described for Indicator 4A.

In eight of the nine identified districts, reviews found that policies, procedures or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy and that those districts were not in compliance with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. In those districts, corrective actions were ordered which require the districts to correct all individual child noncompliance and to demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements through submission of follow-up documentation. Also, the LEAs were required to develop an improvement plan which includes the revision of their policies, procedures and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior support and procedural safeguards. In the ninth district, there were no findings of noncompliance which contributed to the significant discrepancy; however, in this district there were other findings of noncompliance which required corrective action. All nine districts provided documentation of correction of individual noncompliance as well as a follow-up sample of student files demonstrating correction of the identified noncompliance within the twelve month timeframe for correction of noncompliance.

In September 2011, OSEP notified the state that it must revise the identification methodology for 4B. Applying the revised methodology, the state identified ten districts and conducted reviews prior to the submission of the 2010-11 APR. Four districts were found to have noncompliance and corrected the noncompliance within twelve months as described above. Per OSEP instructions, correction of noncompliance for the LEAs identified through the revised methodology using 2008-09 and 2009-10 data are also being reported in the 2011-12 APR.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: Using the original identification methodology for 4B, no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. However, in September 2011, OSEP notified the state that it must revise the identification methodology for 4B. Applying the revised methodology, the state identified ten districts and conducted reviews prior to the submission of the 2010-11 APR. Four districts were found to have noncompliance and corrected the noncompliance within twelve months as described above.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: Since no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, no districts were reviewed, and no noncompliance was identified for this indicator.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

2011–12 Improvement Activities
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: Data for all districts is reviewed annually, with two years of data considered each year. Districts with one year of data that suggests discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, along with their RPDC consultants, are notified and offered technical assistance through their local RPDC. Any potential issues which might result in the district being determined to have significant discrepancies in the second year are then identified and addressed. Any districts determined to have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates based on two years of data are reviewed and, if necessary, required to develop an improvement plan and/or corrective action plan.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under categories labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)" and "RPDC Consultants."

Recruit and Develop "Models of Success" in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS):
See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)."

Support the Implementation of a Statewide System of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)."

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants for Development and Implementation of Improvement Plans: Districts completing improvement plans analyze data as a part of the needs assessment. If discipline is identified as an area in need of improvement, the districts must address it through objectives and strategies. Depending upon the results of the Department's review, districts identified with significant discrepancies in the area of suspension/expulsion may also be required to develop an improvement plan. In both cases, RPDC consultants provide the districts with training and professional development to complete and implement an effective improvement plan.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that one improvement activity regarding improvement planning should be removed from the SPP due to the Office of Special Education removing the requirement for a separate Special Education Improvement Plan and aligning expectations with Department requirements to incorporate all district improvement activities in the District's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP).

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

The State did not, until FFY2011, determine whether districts with a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, based on FFY 2009 data, had policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, and therefore did not make findings of noncompliance until FFY 2011. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FY2011 for this indicator for districts with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009 discipline data. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that these districts have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.

DESE Response

Per OSEP instructions, correction of noncompliance for the LEAs identified through the updated methodology using 2008-09 and 2009-10 data are also being reported in the 2011-12 APR. Based upon the revised methodology required by OSEP in September 2011, ten districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates for 4B. As reported in the 2010-11 APR, four of these districts had findings of noncompliance. The review process to identify noncompliance consisted of a self-assessment and review of policies, procedures and practices by the identified district with phone monitoring for verification of data. In addition, a review of student files was completed in the area of discipline with a desk audit to verify results.

Correction of noncompliance for these four districts occurred within the twelve month timeframe allowed by OSEP. Through its follow-up procedures, the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data (follow-up student files) provided to the Office of Special Education; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:
   A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
   B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
   C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:
A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	A. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class ≥ 80% of the day: 59.5% B. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class < 40% of the day: 10.2% C. Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.5%

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

At 9.4%, the state met the target of 10.2% for Indicator 5B. At 58.9% and 3.6%, the targets of 59.5% and 3.5% for Indicators 5A and 5C respectively were not met; however, improvement continues to be shown for Indicator 5A.

Special Education Placement Data for ages 6–21						
	2009-10		**2010-11**		**2011-12**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
Inside Regular Class ≥ 80% (5A)	66,653	58.4%	65,248	58.6%	**64,212**	**58.9%**
Inside Regular Class 40-79%	29,290	25.7%	28,601	25.7%	27,978	25.6%
Inside Regular Class < 40% (5B)	10,948	9.6%	10,384	9.3%	**10,219**	**9.4%**
Separate School	3,481	3.0%	3,258	2.9%	3,189	2.9%
Homebound/Hospital	696	0.6%	715	0.6%	698	0.6%
Residential Facility	4	0.0%	4	0.0%	7	0.0%
Total Separate (5C)	4,181	3.7%	3,977	3.6%	**3,894**	**3.6%**
Correctional Facilities	952	0.8%	917	0.8%	832	0.8%
Parentally-Placed Private School	2,142	1.9%	2,146	1.9%	1,956	1.8%
Total School Age	114,166	100.0%	111,273	100.0%	109,091	100.0%

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements via MOSIS Student Core. The count date for each year is December 1 and are the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 3.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

With 58.9%, the state did not meet the target of 59.5% for Inside Regular Class ≥ 80% (5A). With 9.4%, the state met the target of 9.6% for Inside Regular Class < 40% (5B). At 3.6%, the state did not meet the target of 3.5% for Separate Settings (5C). While the targets for 5A and 5C were not met, the data

indicates progress from the previous year for 5A and no slippage for 5C. Analysis of statewide data shows that, with few exceptions, most districts have shown steady percentages in all placement areas for the past five years. As the IDEA requires LEAs to maintain a continuum of placement options and placement is an Individual Education Program (IEP) team decision, it is difficult to determine the percentages that are ultimately appropriate for each placement category. As described below, the state continues to emphasize placement in the LRE through technical assistance and professional development activities.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Support the use of three-tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching, differentiated instruction).
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants on evidence based instructional strategies for differentiated instruction, three-tiered models and co-teaching to promote placement with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants on Standards Based IEPs to promote provision of services with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Support the Use of Three-Tiered Intervention Models and Inclusive Instructional Practices: The Office of Special Education has numerous activities which focus on support for districts to use three-tiered models of Prevention/Intervention. Those activities are:
- *Improvement Grants***:** The Office of Special Education awards $2,000,000 in Improvement Grants to districts annually. Criteria for obtaining a special education improvement grant include an emphasis on the use of tiered-models of intervention and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching and differentiated instruction). See Overview under the category labeled Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants.
- *Demonstration Sites***:** See APR overview under the categories labeled Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support Network and Response to Intervention.
- *State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)***:** The SPDG, awarded in 2007, is a project to develop and implement an integrated model of tiered student support. The project at the present time is in a pilot phase, but plans are to scale up statewide in the future. See APR overview under the category labeled Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant.
- *eMINTS***:** See APR overview under category labeled Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS).

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants on Evidence-Based Instructional Strategies: The Office of Special Education has developed training modules for use by the RPDC consultants in the areas of differentiated instruction and co-teaching. The co-teaching materials were developed by Dr. Marilyn Friend. A DVD about co-teaching has also been produced and provided to the RPDCs to use in the trainings. Regional Consultants provide at least one co-teaching and one differentiated instruction training annually in each RPDC region across the state. In addition, the Office of Special Education has provided the RPDC consultants with materials and training on three-tiered models of intervention. See APR overview under the category labeled Response to Intervention. During the 2011-12 school year, RPDC consultants held 65 co-teaching trainings and 38 differentiated instruction trainings across the state; there were 1,142 and 936 participants in co-teaching training and differentiated instruction training respectively.

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants on Standards Based IEPs: See Overview under category labeled "Standards-based IEPs."

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance to Districts Identified as Not Meeting or in Danger of Not Meeting State Targets: The Office of Special Education makes data on educational environments by district and region available to RPDC directors and consultants on an annual basis. These data are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions that are in danger of not meeting the targets for each of the sub indicators, indicating needed training and/or technical assistance. Once districts are identified regional school improvement teams work with those districts to develop and implement an improvement plan specific to district needs. These plans include a needs assessment based upon data analysis, coaching, technical assistance and provision of professional development to district staff.

The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) targets complete an improvement plan. Districts completing improvement plans will analyze LRE data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, can address it through an objective and strategies. For the 2011-12 school year, 68 (or 37% of self-assessment districts) school districts were required to address LRE in their improvement plan. The percentage of districts required to address LRE increased over the prior year, however this was not unexpected as the criteria was increased and the minimum n size was decreased.

RPDC consultants continue to make trainings available to all districts using LRE training modules for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education. In addition, the Department-supported Co-Teaching module, based on the trainings of Marilyn Friend, continues to be disseminated by the RPDC consultants. Office of Special Education staff is working with e-Learning for Educators to make LRE training modules accessible via the web.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under categories labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)" and "RPDC Consultants." The Office of Special Education has collaborated with Dr. Erica Lembke at the University of Missouri to develop a two-part RtI overview available online and in DVD format and provided an opportunity for "ask the expert" questions from the field. The overview is available at dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/rti/webinars_presentations.html. Regular reminders of the availability of this training are sent to the field via the special education SELS Listserv.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that two improvement activities needed revisions to wording to improve clarity.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:
  A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
  B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:
A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	Not applicable due to data collection changes.

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

Per OSEP instructions, states are to establish a new baseline, target and, as needed, improvement activities for this indicator using 2011-12 data. See State Performance Plan for indicator data and other required information.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

Not applicable.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:
   A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
   B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
   C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
     (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:
Outcomes:
   A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
   B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
   C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:
   a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
   b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
   c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
   d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
   e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:
Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus [# of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
2011-12	Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
	Summary Statement 1	92.7%	93.8%	90.7%
	Summary Statement 2	55.6%	42.4%	60.7%

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

2011-12 Early Childhood Outcomes Data						
	A: Positive social-emotional skills		B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
	# children	% children	# children	% children	# children	% children
a. Did not improve functioning	70	1.5%	83	1.7%	74	1.5%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable	177	3.7%	136	2.8%	198	4.1%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	2,018	42.0%	2,498	52.0%	1,722	35.8%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable	1,482	30.8%	1,619	33.7%	1,629	33.9%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable	1,059	22.0%	470	9.8%	1,183	24.6%
Total	4,806	100.0%	4,806	100.0%	4,806	100.0%

2011-12 Early Childhood Outcomes Summary Statements			
	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs
	% of children	% of children	% of children
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited	93.4%	94.9%	92.5%
2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited.	52.9%	43.5%	58.5%

Definition of "Comparable to Same-Aged Peers"

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) personnel, "comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a rating of "5" on a scale of 1–5, meaning "completely (all of the time/typical)" in response to the question "To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?" A rating of "5" roughly translates to a 0–10% delay.

Instruments and Procedures for Assessment and Data Reporting of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO):
- First Steps and ECSE use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument. A decision was made to allow the ECSE personnel to determine the

appropriate assessment tools to use to collect data for this indicator. No approved list of instruments has been or will be compiled.

- The Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) is used to synthesize the information into a comprehensive summary. The MOSS is located online at dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html.
- The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to the Department.
- Each eligible child entering First Steps or ECSE beginning October 2006 must have an ECO rating if the child will be in the program at least six months.
- No sampling is used. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more will be assessed.
- Entry and exit data must be recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively.
- A rating of 1–5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely."
- All entry and exit data collected during a given year must be submitted electronically to the Department at the end of that year.
- The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings.
- More information can be obtained at dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html and in the SPP.

The State of Missouri is currently conducting a pilot of several early childhood assessment instruments with the intent of arriving at a more uniform assessment profile across the state for all students, including students with disabilities. It is expected that a decision regarding an instrument will be made for the 2013-14 school year.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

At 93.4%, 94.9% and 92.5%, Missouri met all three targets for Summary Statement One for outcomes A (92.7%), B (93.8%) and C (90.7%). At 52.9%, 43.5% and 58.5%, Missouri did not meet the targets for Summary Statement Two for outcomes A (55.6%) or C (60.7%), but did meet the target for outcome B (42.4%). Percentages for Summary Statement One remained high, and percentages for Summary Statement Two all showed improvement over the previous year.

In reviewing data for the Missouri Part C Indicator 3, Missouri Part C also met the targets for Summary Statement 1 for each of the three outcome areas and did not meet the targets for Summary Statement 2 for any of the three outcome areas. Missouri Part C has narrow eligibility criteria of half-age delay and does not serve at risk children. The results for this indicator are demonstrative of the State's eligibility criteria since the children who are entering the First Steps program show increased growth, yet they are not exiting at age expectations.

Due to the population being served in First Steps, most children continue to be eligible and receive services in Part B, Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE). As demonstrated in the data above, children receiving services in Part B (ECSE) continue to grow and make progress on these outcomes; however, due to the severity of disabilities of children transitioning from Part C, they are not exiting Part B performing at age expectations.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Provide Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) training through periodic face-to-face and online trainings to improve administration of the ECO assessment and data collection and reporting for Early Childhood Outcomes.
- Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO data through the use of common identification numbers (MOSIS) on an annual basis to ensure the reliability and validity of the data.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.

- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide ECO Training: Most ECO training materials, including handouts and resources are posted on the Office of Special Education website at http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html. In 2010-11, a video presentation was made available as an online module in order to record the type and number of participants accessing the video training. In 2010-11, there were 21 registrants from higher education, early intervention and other professionals who completed the online module. In 2011-12, the number of registrants increased to 24 from public schools, higher education, early intervention and other professionals who completed the online module. Though the number of registrants increased slightly it is still a very low representation of professionals working in the First Steps and ECSE programs. However, as indicated above, all other training materials are available on the DESE website. Data show there were 3,432 hits on this site in the past 12 months. The state is considering revisions to the training materials and marketing strategies to increase participants using the video presentation for 2012-13.

ECSE and First Steps personnel receive regular reminders through listserv messages regarding the availability of the materials and the importance of training for staff who will be administering the assessment and the timely and accurate reporting of the data.

Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO Data through MOSIS annually: The state encourages ECSE and First Steps personnel to collaborate in the assignment of the First Steps exit ratings and ECSE entry ratings.

In previous years, State staff found First Steps personnel were reporting data primarily via parent input while ECSE personnel were reporting data primarily via assessment results. The State then modified the data collection procedures for ECO so all First Steps and ECSE ratings must include three sources of information: parent input, professional observation and assessment results. The State encourages First Steps and ECSE personnel to collaborate in the assignment of a First Steps exit rating in order for the ECSE entry rating to be the same.

For the past three years, state staff has performed cross checks of First Steps exit and ECSE entry ratings. The trend analysis indicates that the match rate has remained at approximately 30-35% of children having matching entry/exit ratings; however, data also shows that the match rate varies across regions in the state. Further analysis will be used to target technical assistance to ECSE and First Steps personnel to improve the match rate.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: The Office of Special Education makes data available to RPDC directors and consultants on a regular basis. ECO data were first publicly reported for the 2009-10 school year and are shared annually with the RPDC personnel in order to identify districts within their regions requiring training and technical assistance.

Finally, state staff attended the 2011 national conference on Measuring & Improving Child & Family Outcomes in order to review the procedures that other states utilize and to review the national materials regarding ECO policies. These materials and policies will be reviewed by state staff and used in training and policy guidance wherever appropriate.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices: See APR Overview under category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, one improvement activity was added.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.

DESE Response
The state has reported progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with this APR.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	80.0% of parents will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

At 77.8% of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, Missouri did not meet the target of 80% established for the 2011-12 school year.

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) has the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting Missouri school districts. Since the inception of MSIP in 1990, MSIP reviews have been conducted on a five-year cycle with approximately 100 (or 20%) of the 523 districts as well as other responsible public agencies reviewed each year. These reviews included the distribution of surveys to students, teachers, administrators and parents. Parent surveys were used to collect information on participation in special education and other programs, the level of parental involvement in various school related activities, and parent perceptions of school, staff, teachers, administrators and learning environment. The surveys were sent to all parents in the approximately 100 school districts undergoing MSIP reviews each year.

During 2010-11, the Department revised the MSIP process. The new process was implemented during the 2011-12 school year. MSIP has now changed to an annual process and is based predominantly on school performance data. MSIP no longer conducts onsite reviews in every district and the above-described parent questionnaires are no longer administered, except by districts on a voluntary basis. As a result, the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire (AQ) is no longer available to the Office of Special Education for data collection purposes on Indicator 8. In order to continue with the Parent Survey for the 2011-12 school year, the Office of Special Education created a survey which was a subset of the original MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire. This survey was sent to districts conducting their self-assessment as part of their special education monitoring. At the same time, the OSE began working with the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA) at the University of Missouri to develop and disseminate a Parent Survey during the 2012-13 school year.

Survey Instrument

The 2012 Parent Survey was comprised of six main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey also included two demographic questions regarding school district and county location within Missouri. The survey was sent to the 184 school districts that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes. The districts were instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of students with disabilities. Parents could respond online via Survey Monkey or could request and complete a paper form. All surveys were due back by June 1st, 2012. The following questions were listed as part of the survey:
- My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement
- The school encourages parents to be involved
- The educational and career goals developed for my child are appropriate to his/her needs
- The school encourages student involvement in post-secondary planning

- Over the past year, the school's education and/or services have helped me and/or my family feel that I can get the educational services and supports that my child and family need
- Over the past year, the school's education and/or services have helped me and/or my family understand the roles and responsibilities of the people who work with my child and my family

In order to stay consistent with previous years' data, only the following two questions were used for this indicator:
- My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement
- The school encourages parents to be involved

If parents agree or strongly agree with both, then they are counted as being in agreement with this SPP indicator. The table below shows the rates of agreement with both items for parents of students with disabilities.

Results of Parent Survey

Parents of Students with Disabilities	Agree	Not Agree	Total
2011-12	2,503 (**77.8%)**	715 (22.2%)	3,218 (100.0%)
2010-11	5,664 (71.4%)	2,270 (28.6%)	7,934 (100.0%)
2009-10	4,565 (69.3%)	2,027 (30.7%)	6,592 (100.0%)
2008-09	5,103 (69.6%)	2,234 (30.4%)	7,337 (100.0%)
2007-08	4,077 (72.3%)	1,560 (27.7%)	5,637 (100.0%)
2006-07	4,461 (69.4%)	1,965 (30.6%)	6,426 (100.0%)

The return rate for the 2011-12 data was 10.1%. Regional return rates ranged from 6.3% in the Southeast region to 19.6% in the Central region. The low return rate was due in part to late dissemination of the survey to school districts and difficulties on the part of districts in getting the electronic survey to parents. The 2012-13 collection will use the same or similar survey instrument, but the Office of Special Education will be contracting with the University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis to disseminate the surveys to districts and collect results. Making the survey available earlier in the school year and allowing a variety of methods for responding (electronic, paper, etc.) is expected to increase the return rate for future years.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

With an agreement rate of 77.8%, the state did not meet the target of 80.0% established for the 2011-12 school year; however, improvement is evident over the previous years. Due to the process of using monitoring cohorts of districts for data collection, it is difficult to analyze progress or slippage and any effects from the implementation of Improvement Activities.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Develop an improved data collection process to measure parent involvement.
- Support Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers.
- Support through the MPACT a parent mentor program that provides Technical Assistance (TA) and support to parents of students with disabilities.
- Support, through Project ACCESS and MPACT, the provision of materials, information, training, and resource referrals for parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).
- Support professional development for Parents as Teachers (PAT) parent educators to increase their knowledge and ability to inform and assist families of children with disabilities to link with needed resources.

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in parental involvement to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Develop and provide a Parent and Family Involvement training module to facilitate improved involvement of parents/families of students with disabilities in their children's education.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Develop an Improved Data Collection Process to Measure Parent Involvement: The 2012 Parent Survey was comprised of six main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey also included two demographic questions regarding school district and county location within Missouri. The survey was sent to the 184 school districts that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes. The districts were instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of students with disabilities. Parents could respond online via Survey Monkey or could request and complete a paper form. All surveys were due back by June 1, 2012.

Support MPACT to Provide Training, Resources and Materials: The Department supports the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent and family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers. Information was provided through the MPACT newsletter in the following areas: IEP process, other IDEA processes, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and Section 504 of the ADA. The MPACT e-newsletter was sent bi-monthly via Listserv and posted on the MPACT website. Online database resources were frequently updated to fulfill the Department's reporting requirements. There were 108 updates made to the MPACT website during July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012. Many of the updates contained multiple links and changes to multiple resources. These included updating and re-uploading all fact sheets, sample forms and letters (112), updating of training calendar, splash pages, update or add new state resource links, researched and corrected broken links, updates to Community Resource Database and mentor trainings. These updates also included the archiving of the e-newsletter and mentor training. The website received 31,622 visitors during this reporting period with 2,817 visits to the Mentor Portal. Parent materials providing information on special education process, IDEA updates, effective practices, state-wide assessment and research-based intervention were provided to the public using various means of distribution. The RtI and tiered model portion of the website received 1,433 page views. In addition, 111 individuals participated in a RtI tiered model of intervention workshop. There were 171 online transition trainings accessed during the 2011-12 schools year in the areas of Connecting Goals to Coordinated Activities, IDEA Transition Requirements, Soft Skills, Solving the Employment Puzzle, Disability Disclosure, and Transition to Postsecondary Experiences. Face to face training held during the 2011-12 school year included self-determination and student led IEP's (90 self advocates, 249 students); transition summit (119 students); career development (12 students); and life after graduation/IEP meeting trainings (30 students).

Support a Parent Mentor Program: To facilitate parent involvement in the LEA and to provide peer support to parents in the special education process, the Department funds MPACT to support a parent mentor program. This program provides technical assistance and support to parents of students with disabilities. MPACT employs six regional coordinators and one mentor coordinator to provide support for 48 parent mentors. MPACT recruits and trains mentors, assists with the certification process, and provides assignments and technical assistance to mentors. This assistance includes coordination and support through monthly trainings and quarterly mentor meetings. MPACT also provides training in data collection for mentors. Online access to monthly trainings, reporting, surveys and technical support is available via a secure site on MPACT's website. In the 2011-12 school year, professional development was delivered to mentors who give peer support to parents in the IEP process. MPACT staff also provided modeling of the IEP process for parent mentors and evaluated the performance of mentors during the IEP process. Information was provided to parents and professionals about tiered interventions and progress monitoring via an online training.

Support Collaboration with ACCESS: MPACT and Project ACCESS collaborated to create materials, information, training and resources for parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD). A training dealing with writing post secondary goals for students with ASD to assist with transition was completed in the summer of 2010. Dissemination of information and training was conducted during the 2011-12 school year. There were 44 parents, students, and educators who attended training for "Writing Post Secondary Goals for Students with ASD."

Support Professional Development for Parents as Teachers (PAT): Support Professional Development for Parents as Teachers (PAT): There were 50 scholarships awarded to parent educators across the state selected by the Parents as Teachers National Center (PATNC). Parent educators eligible for these scholarship awards must have successfully completed PATNC's initial Born to Learn Institute and be working in a Missouri PAT program. Announcement letters were mailed to all district PAT Coordinators inviting them or a parent educator they supervise to apply for a scholarship to the special needs training. The deadline for submission was September 30, 2011. There were 64 applications submitted from 58 districts. Awards were made on a first come, first serve basis with preference given to first-time applicants.

Training was delivered to these educators by Parents as Teachers National trainers each of whom has personal and professional experience in special education. A follow up survey was sent to those who attended training. Of the twenty-four respondents, 100% agreed the professional development supported their work with children and families and indicated they had shared this information with the families served. In addition 91.67% shared information with coworkers, 100% of the respondents had an understanding of how to make referrals to appropriate community resources and 95.83 % utilized information in the training guide to promote positive strategies and adapt activities when working with families. The respondents also indicated after training they referred to the Special Needs Guide as follows: 37.5% used the guide one to five times; 50% five to ten times; and 8.33% more than ten times. The National Early Intervention Guide or State Resource pages were accessed one to five times by 65.22% of the respondents and the handouts were utilized one to ten or more times by 87.5%. As a result of the knowledge gained in the training, it was reported that eight of the regions referred students for further evaluation.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: District-level data on survey results compared to the SPP target was provided to the Regional Professional Development consultants.

Provide Evidence-Based Practices: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)." The MORE website provides information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Recruit and Develop "Models of Success" in Parent Involvement: During 2009-10, an initial district was identified through a nomination process as having a high quality model for encouraging parent involvement by the Department. In the fall of 2010, Missouri initiated a process to solicit additional examples of success in supporting parent involvement programs. This identification process included adapting a selection criteria developed for national models of success initiative so that it was specific to Missouri. This process included a scoring rubric regarding critical aspects of effective practices and programs. Each selected model will work with the Department to create a description of the program. In the 2011-12 school year, the Department created a parent webpage to showcase parent Models of Success as well as resources for parents and districts. The Department webpage provides information about the Models of Success. It can be found here: dese.mo.gov/se/se-ep-parentinvolvement.htm The Office of Special Education has also been collecting information from the 14 pilot schools/districts that participate in the SPDG MIM project (see Overview for more information). Parent and community involvement is one of the 11 essential elements in this model, and all of the 14 districts report they have been developing and implementing research-based parent involvement activities as a part of their MIM activities.

Develop and Provide a Parent and Family Involvement Training Module: Based upon information obtained in the Quality Indicator Needs Assessment administered to district personnel by the Transition Coalition, a module for parent and family involvement in the transition process was developed and disseminated to the RPDC consultants in the 2011-12 school year. Additionally in February 2012, a full-day statewide workshop, *Facilitating Family Engagement in Transition,* was held in Columbia, MO. This workshop provided information, strategies and learning activities on listening to families, inviting involvement, facilitating participation in IEP meetings, and collaboratively implementing the IEP. There were 170 transition professionals who registered for the training.

Throughout the presentation, participants were asked to complete action plans. The action plans describe the steps participants want to take "to facilitate family engagement in transition." The action plans include four domains: (1) listening to families, (2) inviting involvement, (3) facilitating participation in IEP meetings, and (4) collaboratively implementing the IEP. The presentation was divided into the same domains, and after each section of the presentation, participants were asked to complete the steps for that domain. Participants were asked to write three action steps per domain, and following each action step, there are spaces for "who" will implement the step, "by when," and "what's the outcome?"

In May (three months after the workshop), participants were asked to complete an online survey to determine how many and which action steps they had completed. Twenty-five participants responded. Respondents indicated that 90% had implemented 1-12 action steps toward completing one of these goals. Further follow-up with this group will be made to determine impact and the degree to which implementation of action plans has facilitated family engagement.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."
Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2011, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2011 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2012. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

The state met the 2011-12 target of 0% of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (0/569 LEAs = 0%) having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The state's identification method uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. Based on this, the working definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique district characteristics are also considered so that districts are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the district boundaries or other similar situations. The table below summarizes the criteria.

Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"	
Risk Ratio	**Cell size**
• Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation	• At least 20 in racial/ethnic group AND • At least 20 in comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all districts/LEAs are examined every year. Using a cell size of 20 for both the racial/ethnic group and the comparison group of all other racial/ethnic groups, out of a total of 569 local education agencies, the following numbers of districts were examined for disproportionate representation:

- White: 115
- Black: 73
- Hispanic: 49
- Asian: 16
- Native American: 5
- Pacific Islander: 0
- Multi-racial: 23

Based on the information above, a total of 115 districts had the minimum "n" size for one or more racial/ethnic groups. This resulted in 454 (569 – 115) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations.

The following table displays the numbers of LEAs meeting the criteria for two consecutive years and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified with overrepresentation. As stated previously, LEAs are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

2011-12 Indicator 9 Identification Data		
Year	**Number of LEAs meeting overrepresentation criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)**	**Number of LEAs with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification**
2011-12 identification using data from 2010-11 & 2011-12	0	0

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on MOSIS/Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (MOSIS/Core Data Screen 16) for a total of 569 LEAs.

As indicated in the table above, in 2011-12 no LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2010-11 and 2011-12, therefore no reviews were conducted, resulting in no LEAs with disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

0% of LEAs (0 / 569 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that were the result of inappropriate identification since none had disproportionate representation.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance
There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2010-11; therefore no correction was required.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance
There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2009-10; therefore no correction was required.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance
There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2008-09; therefore no correction was required.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)
N/A. There were no findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

The state met the 2010–11 target of 0% of LEAs having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

2011–12 Improvement Activities
- Provide training and information to districts on the state's process for identification and review of districts with disproportionate representation.
- Provide training and professional development resources to districts identified with inappropriate identification.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Training and Information on Identification and Review Process to Districts: The initial identification is based on the Special Education child count and district enrollment data. Information on the identification and review process of districts is included in various trainings regarding special education data and compliance such as New Directors of Special Education Institute held in July 2011, Special Education Administrators Conference held in September 2011, monthly webinars, and Special Education monitoring training held in October and November 2011. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are assigned a special education supervisor to assist them with the monitoring process.

Provide Training and Professional Development: Training and professional development from RPDC special education improvement consultants are available to aid in developing strategies to increase instructional effectiveness for all students. A self-assessment tool from the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) that allows schools to conduct a self-assessment of their programs and practices in five domains: (a) School Governance, Organization, Policy and Climate; (b) Family Involvement; (c) Curriculum; (d) Organization of Learning; and (e) Special Education Referral Process and Programs is available at nccrest.org/publications/tools/assessment.html. The Department has made available numerous resources to improve instructional effectiveness through the use of tiered intervention models that may be accessed at dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are encouraged to use these resources to enhance instructional effectiveness, increase student achievement and eliminate disproportionate representation through effective referral and identification procedures.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: Data for all districts is reviewed annually, with two years of data considered each year. When data suggest that disproportionate representation is or could become an issue, districts and their RPDC consultants are notified. Technical assistance is available through the RPDCs.

Identify and Disseminate Training and Technical Assistance Resources and Support for Identified Districts: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100. Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2011, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2011, i.e., after June 30, 2012. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	**Measurable and Rigorous Target**
2011-12	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

The state met the 2011-12 target of 0% of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (0/569 LEAs = 0%) having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

See information in APR Indicator 9 for a description of the methodology used to identify and review LEAs with disproportionate representation. The table below summarizes the criteria used for identifying under and over representation for all racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"	
Risk Ratio	**Cell size**
Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation	At least 20 in disability and racial/ethnic group AND At least 20 in disability and comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all LEAs are examined every year. Using a cell size of 20 for both the racial/ethnic group and the comparison group of all other racial/ethnic groups, out of a total of 569 local education agencies, the following numbers of districts were examined for disproportionate representation:

Disproportionate Representation Districts Examined								
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	Multi Racial	Unduplicated Districts Included	Unduplicated Districts Excluded
SLD	57	43	19	1	1	0	4	57	512
Autism	22	13	2	2	0	0	1	23	546
Sp/Lang	53	32	18	4	0	0	4	53	516
ED	19	19	1	0	0	0	1	20	549
ID	25	21	3	1	0	0	1	26	543
OHI	38	32	3	1	0	0	2	39	530

Based on the table above, 66 districts were evaluated for one or more disability and race/ethnicity combinations. This results in 503 (569–66) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations. The following table displays the numbers of LEAs meeting the criteria for 2011-12 and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified for each disability category. As stated previously, LEAs are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

2011-12 Indicator 10 Identification Data		
Year	Number of districts meeting overrepresentation criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)	Number of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification
2011-12 identification using data from 2010-11 & 2011-12	• SLD: 0 in any race/ethnicity category • Autism: 0 in any race/ethnicity category • Sp/Lang: 0 in any race/ethnicity category • ED: 0 in any race/ethnicity category • ID: 3 LEAs with overrepresentation of black students • OHI: 0 in any race/ethnicity category	• SLD: 0 • Autism: 0 • Sp/Lang: 0 • ED: 0 • ID: 0 • OHI: 0

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on MOSIS/Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (MOSIS/Core Data Screen 16) for a total of 569 LEAs. Note: Information provided for the following disability categories: Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Autism, Speech/Language (Sp/Lang), Emotional Disturbance (ED), Intellectual Disability (ID) and Other Health Impaired (OHI).

As indicated in the table above, for 2011-12, three districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2010-11 and 2011-12. All three were identified in the area of overrepresentation of black students with Intellectual Disability.

Monitoring reviews of the three districts with overrepresentation of black students with intellectual disabilities indicated that the disproportionate representation was not a result of inappropriate identification. Two of the three districts had been previously identified for five consecutive years. During those five years, those districts received a comprehensive monitoring review in year one (self-assessment of policies/practices/practices and file review with desk audit and phone verification) and a modified review in years two through five (self-assessment of p/p/p only with phone verification). As this was the 6th year of identification and both districts completed a comprehensive review in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination with a desk audit to verify results. No findings were found related to inappropriate identification in these two districts. Findings of noncompliance not related to inappropriate identification were found in one district and this district provided documentation of correction of individual noncompliance as well as a follow-up sample of student files demonstrating correction of the identified noncompliance within the twelve month timeframe for correction of noncompliance. For the third district, this was the third year of identification of disproportionate representation. This district had previously completed a comprehensive monitoring of its policies/procedures/practices; therefore, it received a modified review as described above. There were no findings of noncompliance due to inappropriate identification as a result of this review.

0% of districts (0 / 569 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that were the result of inappropriate identification.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance
No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2010-11, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance
No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2009-10, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance
No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2008-09, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

The state met the 2011-12 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.
See Indicator 9 for a discussion of improvement activities completed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find
---

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60-days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in a. but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.
Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	100% of children will be evaluated within 60-days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

While Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, evaluations were completed within timelines 97.9% of the time. The State of Missouri has established a state timeline of 60 days for completion of initial evaluations which is the same as the federal timeline; however Missouri regulations allow for an extension of the timeline if there are exceptional circumstances such as delays due to family or child illness or school delays due to inclement weather or extended school breaks.

The State Regulations (Regulation III – Identification and Evaluation Page 32–33. dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/Inc_By_Ref_Mat/documents/FinalRegulationIIIIdentificationandEvaluation4-07.pdf) include the following language regarding initial evaluation timelines:

Evaluation Timelines
The public agency shall provide the parent with a Notice of Intent to Evaluate as soon as possible, but within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of referral for evaluation. Delays beyond this time may be permitted for just cause (school breaks for summer or holidays, student illness, etc.) and documented in the student's record.

The evaluation shall be completed and a decision regarding eligibility rendered within sixty (60) calendar days following parent consent or notice, as the case may be. Delays beyond this time may be permitted for just cause and documented in the student's record.

Initial Evaluation (34 CFR 300.301)
Each public agency shall conduct a full and individual initial evaluation, in accordance with 34 CFR 300.305 and 34 CFR 300.306, before the initial provision of special education and related services to a child with a disability. This may or may not include additional testing as determined by the evaluation team members.

Either a parent of a child or a public agency may initiate a request for an initial evaluation to determine if the child is a child with a disability.

The initial evaluation must be conducted within sixty (60) days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation, may be extended for just cause, and must consist of procedures to determine if the child is a child with a disability as defined in this State Plan and to determine the educational needs of the child.

If a parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for evaluation or, if a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the evaluation timeline has begun and prior to the determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability, the sixty (60) day timeframe does not apply. An exception to this applies only if the subsequent public agency is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent and the subsequent public agency agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.

The screening of a student by a teacher or specialist to determine appropriate instructional strategies for curriculum implementation shall not be considered to be an evaluation for eligibility for special education and related services.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60-days, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is part of the Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes districts in all regions of the state.

These data were gathered in the web-based IMACS. Districts entered the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:
- Student's initials
- Date of parental consent to evaluate
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible Y/N
- Eligibility determined in 60-days (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
  - Acceptable reason Y/N

Verification of the district reported evaluation timeline data was completed by compliance supervisors or by on-site visits conducted by compliance supervisors and other assigned Department staff.

The file review process included checking the 60-day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the districts included initial evaluation timelines which were not within 60-days, the following criteria were accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:
- Snow days or other school closures due to inclement weather (per State Regulation)
- Agency vacation days (per State Regulation)
- Child's absence because of illness (per State Regulation)
- Summer break (per State Regulation)
- Parent refuses/fails to produce child (per 300.301(d))
- Change in district of enrollment during evaluation process (per 300.301(d))

Delays were considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions did not meet the established acceptable criteria or if the districts failed to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Initial Evaluation Timelines 2011-12					
Year	Number with consent to evaluate	Number within 60-day timeline	Number > 60-days with acceptable reason	Number within 60-days or with acceptable reason	Percent within acceptable timelines
2011-12 Total	5,732 (a)	5,053	558	5,611 (b)	**97.9%**
Source: Data reported via IMACS from a total of 184 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2011-12. A total of 178 of the 184 districts conducted initial evaluations during the year. Acceptable delays are included in the numerator and denominator of the percent within acceptable timelines.					

Calculation = (b / a) x 100 where a = the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received; b = the number whose evaluations were completed within 60-days or with acceptable reason.

One child who fell within the exceptions in 34 CFR 300.301(d) was excluded from the numerator and denominator of the calculation.

Percent within Acceptable Timelines Trend						
Year	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11	2011-12
Percent within acceptable timelines	94.0%	97.1%	97.8%	96.8%	97.8%	**97.9%**

The number of days past the 60-day timeline ranged from one day to 202 days, with over 82% of the delays due to acceptable reasons. One district reported a 202 day delay due to the district waiting for evaluation information. This was not acceptable. The district was given a corrective action which required training and submission of additional documentation of meeting initial timelines. Approximately 87% of the delays were 20 days or less with 64% of the delays ten days or less and 41% of the delays five days or less. The longest unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being completed or returned in a timely fashion. Most timelines deemed unacceptable were due to valid extensions that did not cover the entire amount of delay (i.e., delay was ten days, but only six of those days had acceptable reasons); delayed evaluations; or lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks. The districts found out of compliance with this indicator were required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of notification.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance
The state verified all districts with identified noncompliance were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification through its follow-up procedures of submission of additional timeline data for initial evaluations in IMACS (Prong 1). The state also verified that all individual child noncompliance was corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year of notification (Prong 2).

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance
Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance
Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)
Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

At 97.9%, the state is not meeting the target of 100%, but is continuing to address this indicator at a high rate of compliance. The 97.9% rate is a slight increase from the previous year. It has been determined through a review of the improvement activities that no changes or additions need to be made at this time.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.

- Provide training and professional development to all districts to increase compliance in the area of initial evaluation timelines.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Targeted Technical Assistance: State Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) special education compliance consultants worked with Office of Special Education compliance supervisors to target the districts that needed assistance in meeting the 60-day timeline for completing initial evaluations. Compliance supervisors notified RPDC compliance consultants of districts that received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of 60-day timelines. Upon notification, the RPDC consultants worked with districts to assist them in determining the reasons for the delays and to ensure they developed strategies to correct the non-compliance.

Ongoing Training and Professional Development: Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is invited to attend self-assessment training in the fall prior to their MSIP review year. In this training emphasis is placed upon public agencies completing the evaluation process within 60 calendar days. Acceptable reasons for an extension to the 60-day timelines are reviewed during the self-assessment training.

In order for new directors in the state to be properly informed and to provide guidance to their district staff regarding the 60-day timeline for evaluation, compliance training with emphasis on this timeline is a part of the annual New Directors' Training.

The Office of Special Education website has web stream presentations that provide training on the 60-day timeline requirement. Finally, listserv messages and webinar presentations by Office of Special Education (OSE) staff remind public agencies of the importance of adhering to this timeline.

Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

DESE Response
The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all LEAs with identified noncompliance (1) were correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through onsite monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

After an evaluation of the improvement activities for this indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR 300.301(d) applied.
e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.
Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

With 95.5% of Part C to Part B transition timelines met for 2011-12, Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, but continues to see a compliance rate over 95%.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60-days, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is part of the Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three-year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and include districts in all regions of the state.

Data for 2011-12 were gathered in the web-based IMACS which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Districts enter the following information for each student referred from Part C during the reporting period:
- Student's initials
- Date of birth
- Date of referral
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
  - Acceptable reason Y/N

The information is reviewed by compliance supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments. The only acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline are failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner or failure of the parent to make the child available for evaluation.

Part C to Part B Referrals	
	2011-12
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination	461
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday (includes 10 children determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined after the third birthday)	55
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	337
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR 300.301(d) applied	46
e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays (NEW LANGUAGE)	7
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday (# in a, but not b, c, d, or e)	16
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total Eligible) = c / (a-b-d-e)	**95.5%**

Source: District reported data (via IMACS) from a total of 184 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2011-12. A total of 78 of the 184 districts had received referrals from Part C.

Percent within Acceptable Timelines Trend						
Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
%	80.3%	88.6%	91.3%	95.0%	96.6%	**95.5%**

Of the 16 children who did not have the IEP in place by the third birthday, all but five had their IEPs in place within one month of turning three. Four more children had their IEPs in place within two months of the third birthday. The district indicated that the fifth child was enrolled in the district's preschool on the third birthday, but the IEP was not implemented until 82 days after the third birthday.

The districts found out of compliance with this indicator were required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of notification.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance
The state, through its follow-up procedures, which include submission of a second set of timeline data for additional children transitioning from Part C to Part B, verified that all districts with identified noncompliance were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that all individual child noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance
Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance
Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)
Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

There was slight slippage from the prior year at 96.6% to this reporting period at 95.5%; however the compliance rate remains at a high level and above 95%.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Provide training and professional development to all districts to improve collaboration and coordination with families and Part C agencies in the area of C to B Transition timelines.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Ongoing Training and Technical Assistance: RPDC special education compliance consultants work with Office of Special Education supervisors to target the districts that need assistance in meeting the Part C to B timelines. Compliance supervisors notify RPDC compliance consultants of districts that received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of Part C to B timelines. The RPDC consultants assisted districts in determining the reasons for the delays and developing strategies to correct the non-compliance.

Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is invited to attend self assessment training in the fall prior to their tiered monitoring review year. In this training, emphasis is placed upon public agency's knowledge regarding students transitioning from Part C to Part B. In order for new Directors of Special Education in the state to be properly informed and to provide guidance to their staff regarding students referred by Part C and having an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday, a compliance training with emphasis on this timeline is a part of the annual New Directors' of Special Education Academy.

The Department maintains a webpage specifically for Transition C to B topics in order to organize all transition training materials and technical assistance documents in one place. This page can be viewed at: http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/Transitionindexpg.htm. In the past, statewide Transition C to B trainings were conducted in the spring of every other year. However, due to travel restraints and access to technology such as webinars Part C to Part B meetings and webinars are now held throughout the year. These Part C/B joint trainings include individual System Point of Entry (SPOE) regions and local school district early childhood special education staff.

Meetings and webinars were held throughout the year to support online materials including technical assistance documents and online training modules. In March 2012 and May 2012, Part C to B Transition webinars were conducted to again inform the field about the requirements and timelines for both Part C and Part B. In October 2011 and April 2012, Part C staff presented the First Steps requirements to the ECSE Coalition Meeting of ECSE directors and First Steps providers in the state. Finally, in 2011-12, listserv messages on collaboration between Parts C and B were disseminated to the field throughout the year.

The Department has developed a family information packet on Part C to Part B transition which includes a DVD depicting the transition meeting and participation by early childhood programs at the local school district and community programs such as Head Start as well as a parent handbook covering basic information on the transition process. These packets are made available to families in the Part C system as the service coordinator and family begin discussions about the transition from First Steps to Part B or other services. They are also available to ECSE program staff as a resource. Some regions hold joint Part C and Part B meetings between System Point of Entry (SPOE) staff and local ECSE staff to discuss ways to improve collaboration and communication between the two programs to facilitate successful transitions for families.

Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

DESE Response
The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all LEAs with identified noncompliance (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

After an evaluation of the improvement activities for this indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	**Measurable and Rigorous Target**
2011-12	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

With a compliance rate of 82.3%, the state did not meet the 100% target for 2011-12, but did show progress from the previous year.

Indicator 13 Actual Target Data			
Year	Number of Transition Plans Reviewed	Number that Met Standard	Percent that Met Standard
2009-10	587	536	91.3%
2010-11	569	452	79.4%
2011-12	793	653	**82.3%**

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance The state, through its follow-up procedures, which include submission of additional documentation of transition plans, verified that all districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that all individual child noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance
Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

Actual target data shows an increase in compliance from 2010-11 (79.4%) to 2011-12 (82.3%). During - the 2010-11 monitoring year, the Office of Special Education Compliance Section determined that there was a need to change the procedures for monitoring certain criteria under indicator 13. At the time the decision was made, it was anticipated that this change would impact our compliance percentage until all districts could be retrained on the new criteria. A training plan was developed and is being implemented and resulted in increased compliance for the 2011-12 school year. As evidenced by this increase, the state believes that continued training and technical assistance for districts will result in improved outcomes for the next APR.

2011–12 Improvement Activities
- Provide professional development/training on effective practices in post secondary transition planning to state, regional and district staff.
- Manage and support a web-based data system to track improved performance in effective transition planning.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting, or in danger of not meeting, state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Provide training and technical assistance on the Transition Outcomes Project (TOP) to all districts in order to have districts at 100% compliance on Indicator 13.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Professional Development and Training: The Office of Special Education (OSE) contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary to create an evidence-based practice piece to follow TOP training in the form of a best-practice website. The goal of this website is to provide tools districts can use to begin to understand what works in improving the outcomes of youth with disabilities. Districts can review their post school outcomes and make decisions regarding what areas they would like to implement improvement strategies. The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center in-school "predictors" of post school success in the areas of employment, education, and independent living for youth with disabilities, are placed in rubrics to allow school teams to understand the definition of each one.

The Rubrics provide (a) conversation starters so the predictors can be more easily understood and discussed; (b) three levels of district implementation towards implementation excellence; and (c) types of evidence the district can view to validate their level of implementation. There are also areas for districts to record the types of evidence reviewed and the conversation around the particular predictor. The Resources Repository can then be searched by predictor category so districts can quickly locate high quality resources and evidence-based lesson plans. This website was completed during the 2011-12 school year.

RPDC improvement consultants who deal with post secondary education received Train-the-Trainer instruction on the evidence based practice website in June 2012. They will train schools on the use of the website information during the 2012–13 school year.

Manage and Support a Web-Based Data System: See APR Overview under category labeled "Transition Outcomes Project (TOP)."

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices: See APR Overview under category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: See Indicator 1 of this APR for a description of this activity.

Recruit and Develop Models of Success: See Indicator 1 of this APR for a description of this activity.

Provide Training and Technical Assistance on Transition Outcomes Project (TOP): See APR Overview under category labeled "Transition Outcomes Project (TOP)."

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

DESE Response
The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all LEAs with identified noncompliance (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

After an evaluation of the improvement activities for this indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

---

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:
    A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
    B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
    C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or
    competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	A: 24.4% B: 46.9% C: 51.3%

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

Graduate and Dropout Follow-up Data						
2011-12 Follow-up Data	2010-11 Graduates		2010-11 Dropouts		2010-11 Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
(1) 4-Year College	632	9.1%	2	0.1%	634	7.6%
(2) 2-Year College	1,976	28.6%	13	0.9%	1,989	23.9%
(3) Non-College	253	3.7%	16	1.1%	269	3.2%
(4) Competitive Employment	1,662	24.0%	94	6.7%	1,756	21.1%
(5) Noncompetitive Employment	171	2.5%	5	0.4%	176	2.1%
(6) Military	134	1.9%	0	0.0%	134	1.6%
(7) Continuing Education – did not complete one term	284	4.1%	43	3.1%	327	3.9%
(8) Employed – less than 20 hours/week or 90 days	259	3.7%	21	1.5%	280	3.4%
(9) Other	852	12.3%	237	17.0%	1,089	13.1%
(10) Unknown	695	10.0%	962	69.1%	1,657	19.9%
Total Follow-up	6,918	100.0%	1,393	100.0%	8,311	100.0%

Source: District-reported data via MOSIS Follow-up file

Categories (mutually exclusive)	Number	Percent
1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school [(1) + (2)]	2,623	31.5%
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education) [(4) + (6)]	1,890	22.7%
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) [(3)]	269	3.2%
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed) [(5)]	176	2.1%
Other categories [(7) + (8) + (9) + (10)]	3,353	40.3%
Total Graduates and Dropouts	8,311	100.0%

Summary Measures	Number	Percent
A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2)]	2,623	**31.6%**
B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (4) + (6)]	4,513	**54.3%**
C: Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (3) + (4) + (5) + (6)]	4,958	**59.7%**
Total Graduates and Dropouts	8,311	

Follow-up data are collected on all students with disabilities who graduated or dropped out from grades 9-12 during the previous school year. The data collection is an annual, census collection for all school districts in the state with a 100% response rate.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

At 31.6%, 54.3% and 59.7%, Missouri met all three targets for summary statements A (24.4%), B (46.9%) and C (51.3%) respectively.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting, or in danger of not meeting, state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Provide professional development/technical assistance to districts on data collection for this indicator.
- Support implementation of Project Search to improve employment outcomes for students with disabilities.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: See Indicator 1 of this APR for a description of this activity.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices: See APR Overview under category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Recruit and Develop "Models of Success" in Post Secondary Transition: See Indicator 1 of this APR for a description of this activity.

Provide Professional Development/Technical Assistance to Districts on Data Collection for this Indicator:
The Office of Special Education (OSE) contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary and Ms. Mary Kampa to create an evidence-based practice piece to follow TOP training in the form of a best-practice website. The goal of this website is to provide tools districts can use to better understand what works in improving the outcomes of youth with disabilities. Districts can review their post school outcomes and make decisions regarding what areas they would like to implement improvement strategies. The NSTTAC in-school "predictors" of post school success in the areas of employment, education, and independent living for youth with disabilities are placed into rubrics to allow school teams or individuals to understand the definition of each one and then quickly locate related high quality transition resources.

As a part of the tools developed by O'Leary and Kampa, schools will have access to all district data which can be placed in a variety of rubrics which will analyze the data and allow for data-based decision making for Indicator 14.

A webinar was conducted on December 10, 2010, on reporting of student follow-up data. This webinar reviewed the reporting of follow-up data for the previous year's graduates and dropouts, including the students for which follow-up is required, the codes and definitions used for the collection and the usage of the data. The webinar was recorded and was available to districts to view during the 2011-12 school year. Districts were reminded of this availability at various meetings and conferences, through the OSE Listserv, and during technical assistance phone calls with districts.

The reporting of follow-up data was also reviewed at various conferences including the New Special Education Directors' Institute and the Special Education Administrators' Conference.

Missouri received intensive technical assistance with the National Post School Outcomes Center (NPSO) in the 2011-12 school year. As a part of the technical assistance a plan was developed to provide districts with a template to assist them in collecting additional data as a part of the post-school follow up. In addition a part of the plan was to provide informational webinars and a face-to-face training for districts to assist them in collecting pertinent post school data. These trainings will be held in collaboration with the Office of Data System Management.

Support implementation of Project Search to improve employment outcomes for students with disabilities: The Office of Special Education sent out a Request for Proposal (RFP) during the 2011-12 school year to solicit schools to implement Project Search. Three schools were awarded funds to implement Cohort 1 sites in Missouri. These schools received Project Search training, attended the Project Search National Conference, secured partner businesses and will begin implementation in the fall of 2012.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities. Two new improvement activities were added.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:
a. # of findings of noncompliance
b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.
States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

FFY	**Measurable and Rigorous Target**
2011–12	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

Actual Target Data for 2011–12

At 99.04%, Missouri did not meet the 100% target for correction of noncompliance within 12 months. The Department has strong procedures to ensure that districts submit all documentation of correction of noncompliance at least three months prior to the end of the 12-month timeline. The compliance supervisors and RPDC consultants receive monthly updates of districts still in CAP status and the indicators that remain out of compliance. Through phone calls, emails and letters districts are reminded often of the requirement for correction of all noncompliance within the 12-month timeframe and the consequences for failing to meet that timeline. Districts indicating an inability or unwillingness to correct noncompliance also receive hands-on technical assistance provided by compliance supervisors and RPDC compliance consultants.

In 2010-11, a total of 100 public school districts and seven charter schools had monitoring reports issued, resulting in a total of 107 responsible public agencies. Of these agencies, only one public school district did not correct noncompliance within the 12-month timeframe. However, this district subsequently completed correction of noncompliance and is now in full compliance with the IDEA.

The special education monitoring cycle is part of the Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state. Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:
- # of LEAs issued findings in 2010-11: the total number of agencies that had findings of noncompliance issued in 2010-11
- # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2010-11: the total number of monitoring indicators and/or dispute resolution allegations found out of compliance across the districts/agencies reviewed. This is a duplicated count of districts/agencies when districts/agencies had more than one finding of noncompliance in an SPP indicator area
- # of Findings of noncompliance for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification: the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the reports to districts

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. 14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring Activities:	15	38	38
	Dispute Resolution:	9	9	9
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution:	3	3	3
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring Activities:	9	9	9
	Dispute Resolution:	7	7	7
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Monitoring Activities:	39	208	207
	Dispute Resolution:	2 LEA 1 SEA	4	4
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60-days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities:	61	192	189
	Dispute Resolution:	4	4	4
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities:	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities:	21	39	38
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			519	514
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100			**(b) / (a) X 100 =**	**99.04%**

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance
Missouri had 100% of the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2009 timely corrected and verified within one year of notification, including correction of all individual noncompliance. The state, through its follow-up procedures, verified that all districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification in 100% of the files reviewed. The state also verified that, in addition to the findings of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):
N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):
N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

While Missouri did not meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator, subsequent correction of noncompliance was achieved prior to the submission of this APR. The one LEA that did not correct noncompliance within one year of identification participated in targeted technical assistance and subsequently corrected all noncompliance.

Improvement activities for 2011-12 included the following:
- Implement a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants for development and implementation of corrective action plans.
- Manage general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide a Comprehensive General Supervision System to Ensure Timely Correction of Noncompliance: See APR overview section on Federal Tiered Monitoring Three Year Cohort Cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators.

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants for Development and Implementation of Corrective Action Plans: Many strategies are in place to provide technical assistance to districts that were required to provide evidence of correction of noncompliance within 12 months. Emphasis is placed upon ensuring that Department compliance supervisors have a heightened awareness of the districts that have need of technical assistance in order to correct noncompliance. An agenda item in regular staff meetings with compliance supervisors addresses districts that are out of compliance and the progress being made with those districts to correct their noncompliance. When a Supervisor encounters difficulty in providing the technical assistance to a district via phone or email, the RPDC compliance consultant assigned to the district is contacted and asked to provide targeted technical assistance.

In the Federal Tiered Monitoring training and other state-wide conferences such as the Special Education Administrators' Conference emphasis is placed upon state targets to ensure districts that are preparing for their Federal Tiered Monitoring review understand the importance placed upon meeting targets for students' performance. Federal Tiered Monitoring training maintains its focus upon the importance of correction of noncompliance.

The Department has six regional compliance consultants across the state. These consultants work with districts that have remaining noncompliance as well as providing training and technical assistance on compliance standards and indicators to all districts. Each district with identified noncompliance is assigned to a compliance consultant who assists the districts in correcting the noncompliance as soon as possible after the district receives the report, but in no case later than 12 months after the date of the report.

Communication between compliance supervisors and RPDC compliance consultants provides a strong base for the regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans. Updates about the status of districts' correction of noncompliance are provided to RPDC compliance consultants through meetings, email, and telephone. This ongoing communication results in timely correction of non-compliance.

Manage System to Ensure Timely Correction of Noncompliance: IMACS is the web-based monitoring management system used to monitor district evidence of correction of noncompliance. The system is designed to provide timely feedback to districts as they provide documentation for evidence of correction

to compliance supervisors. Regular staff meetings with compliance supervisors and weekly phone calls with the contracted company, Leader Services, has improved the implementation of IMACS and has increased its usability for districts. Staff will continue to work closely with Leader and districts to provide a comprehensive system to monitor correction of noncompliance.

The assistant director and data specialist of the Compliance Section work closely to communicate to compliance supervisors when district timelines are approaching for correction of noncompliance in 12 months. This diligence has resulted in an extremely high level of correction of noncompliance within 12 months in our state.

The compliance supervisors generate regular data reports to track correction of noncompliance. These reports are used to evaluate the need for actions to be taken to ensure correction within 12 months such as phone calls, emails, letters and other contacts with district administration. These actions ensure that the corrections are made and verified within one year of notification. Staff find the generation of data reports to track correction of noncompliance effective and will continue to use these reports for that purpose.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies for Improving Performance on this Indicator: See APR Overview under category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011–12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
In reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.
In addition, in responding to Indicators 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

DESE Response
See activity descriptions above for follow-up procedures for correct implementation of specific regulatory requirements and correction of individual noncompliance.

As stated above, while all noncompliance identified in 2010-11 was not corrected and verified within one year, all noncompliance was subsequently corrected prior to the submission of this APR. Correction of noncompliance for Indicators 4B, 11, 12 and 13 was addressed under those indicators. The state used the Indicator 15 worksheet to provide the data for this indicator. The worksheet is replicated in this document.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Per OSEP instructions, this indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR for the February 2013 and all subsequent submissions.
.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Per OSEP instructions, this indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR for the February 2013 and all subsequent submissions.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	35.3% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

At 44.1% of resolution sessions resulting in settlement agreements, Missouri met the target of 35.3% established for the 2011-12 school year.

Resolution Session and Settlement Agreement Trend Data							
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Resolution Sessions	32	52	41	25	29	51	34
Settlement Agreements	15	24	20	11	16	10	15
Percent Settlement Agreements	46.9%	46.2%	48.8%	44.0%	55.2%	19.6%	**44.1%**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

The data for 2011-12 shows a significant increase from the previous year in the percent of resolution sessions resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. An analysis of due process data revealed that over half of the resolution sessions that were held but did not reach a settlement agreement were ultimately withdrawn.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Collect information regarding resolution session outcomes to improve data collection.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Collect Information Regarding Resolution Session Outcomes to Improve Data Collection: During 2011-12 procedures were developed and implemented to track and follow-up on resolution session timelines and outcomes. SEA staff is assigned when a request for a due process hearing is filed. Staff communicates with the LEA to remind them of the requirement to conduct a resolution session and of the timelines. Follow-up communication is conducted until the session is held and an outcome determined or until one or both parties agrees not to conduct the resolution session and to proceed with the due process hearing.

An updated Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and Office of Special Education staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. Addendums to the Parent's Guide to Special Education were completed in June 2010 and September 2012 due to changes in federal and state regulations. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state and are available free of charge for dissemination. It is also available free of charge upon request to any person or organization and approximately 11,512 copies were mailed during 2011-12. It is also posted on

the Office of Special Education website. Reminders of the availability of the Parent's Guide are sent regularly to the field.

In September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates and others on the procedures of the dispute resolution system which includes a description of the timelines for due process hearings. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision. Due to statutory revisions in the due process hearing system which became effective August 2012, plans are to revise this video to align with new procedures.

In April 2011, the Office of Special Education presented The Special Education Complaint Process via webinar. The training focused on the options available to parents and districts in the special education complaint process. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision. Due to statutory revisions in the due process hearing system which became effective August 2012, plans are to revise this video to align with new procedures.

All MPACT staff and mentors are vested in supporting parents in the lowest level of resolution appropriate when parents present special education process issues as their need for assistance. In 2011-12, 1,549 dispute resolution materials were disseminated and MPACT dispute resolution trainings were attended by 293 participants. In 2011-12, one-on-one assistance data collection indicated that the following actions were taken or intended to be taken by parents:
- Letter of understanding (1,131)
- Request for Notice of Action (1,018)
- Request for mediation (54)
- Request for resolution conference (4)
- Contact DESE compliance (107)
- Contact LEA Special Education Director (662)
- Request an evaluation meeting (30)
- Schedule meetings with school administration (121).

The Office of Special Education uses its Special Education Listservs (SEL/SELS2) to periodically remind the field about parent's rights and dissemination of documents to families which describe those rights, including the Parent's Guide, the Procedural Safeguards, and web-based training.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that an additional improvement activity would be implemented to assist with outcomes for this indicator.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	35.3% of mediations will result in mediation agreements

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

Missouri met the 2011-12 target with 72.0% percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements.

Mediation Agreement Trend Data			
	Mediation Agreements	**Total Mediations Held**	**Percent with Agreements**
2005-06	4	6	66.7%
2006-07	15	27	55.5%
2007-08	11	17	64.7%
2008-09	13	16	81.3%
2009-10	27	30	90.0%
2010-11	41	43	95.3%
2011-12	18	25	**72.0%**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

With 72.0% of mediations resulting in a mediation agreement, Missouri met the target of 35.3% for 2011-12.

2011-12 Improvement Activities
- Provide information on the Missouri complaint system through the Parent's Guide to Special Education.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Information on the Missouri Complaint System through the Parent's Guide to Special Education: An updated Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and Office of Special Education staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. An Addendum to the Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in June 2010 and September 2012 due to changes in federal and state regulations. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state and are available free of charge for dissemination. It is also available free of charge upon request to any person or organization and approximately 11,512 copies were mailed during 2011-12. It is also posted on the Office of Special Education website. Reminders of the availability of the Parent's Guide are sent regularly to the field.

In April 2011, the Office of Special Education staff updated a 2007 web-based video and conducted a webinar to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system as well highlighting the use of mediation prior to as well as during the complaint process. In April, 74 participants viewed the live webinar. Subsequently, due to the passage of a state statute (SB575) which revised the due process

hearing system, this webinar has been temporarily removed from the web and is under revision. It is anticipated that a revised version will be available in Spring, 2013.

In 2011-12, 1,549 dispute resolution materials were disseminated and MPACT dispute resolution trainings were attended by 293 participants.

The Office of Special Education uses its Special Education Listserv (SEL/SELS2) to periodically remind the field about parent's rights and dissemination of documents to families which describe those rights, including the Parent's Guide, the Procedural Safeguards, and web-based training.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that the scope of the improvement activity needed to be broadened to assist with outcomes for this indicator.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, are:
  a. Submitted on or before due dates (first Wednesday in February for child count, including race and ethnicity; and educational environments; first Wednesday in November for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; December 15 for assessment ; May 1 for Maintenance of Effort & Coordinated Early Intervening Services; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
  b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

Actual Target Data for 2011-12

Missouri continues to report all data, including 618 data and SPP/APRs in a timely and accurate fashion.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- **MOSIS:** The Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) is the Department's student-level collection system. The student-level data are aggregated and used for the Section 618 child count, educational environment, exiting, discipline and personnel reporting. These data are also used for APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 14. MOSIS includes a variety of data edit checks to ensure consistency and accuracy of data.
- **Core Data Collection System:** Core Data is a web-based system used to collect data from districts. Most of the collections for student data are now being populated with data from the MOSIS system. The collections populated with MOSIS data continue to utilize edit checking logic as a second screening of the data.
- **Missouri Assessment Program (MAP):** MAP data are used by the Department for ESEA reporting and district accreditation purposes, among others. Pre-coding of student information and a demographic clean-up window ensures accurate information. MAP data are used for the Section 618 Assessment table and for APR Indicator 3.
- **IMACS:** The web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System is used to gather data through special education monitoring self-assessments. Data collected through IMACS and verified by desk review include Initial Evaluation Timelines (APR 11), Timelines for Part C to Part B Transition (APR 12), Transition Planning (APR 13) and correction of noncompliance (APR 15). IMACS is also used to conduct discipline (APR 4) and disproportionality reviews (APR 9/10).
- **Dispute Resolution Database:** The database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 15–19.
- **Other:** The data collections for Parent Involvement (APR 8) are described in the respective SPP or APR sections.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12

Missouri met the target of 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2011-12.

The Department utilizes a variety of data verification methodologies:

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the MOSIS collection system which populates the web-based core data collection system. Manuals with reporting instructions and data edits are important features of both the MOSIS and Core Data systems. New Special Education Directors are trained on the system each year, with on-going technical assistance provided by Department staff for all districts. Throughout 2011-12, Office of Data System Management Special Education staff worked extensively with districts to ensure the accuracy of the data collected at the student level.
- Data editing and validation are handled by Department staff through a variety of means including year to year checks, additional data edits, reports to districts, etc. Any questionable elements are either verified as correct or are corrected by the districts.
- Extensive data profiles have been provided to districts for several years and are also available to the public. These profiles, along with using the data for monitoring and district selection purposes, have ensured more accurate data collection and reporting.
- Staff working with special education data serve as active members of the Department's Core Data Team, and thus have input into changes that may impact the special education data gathered and housed at the Department. The Core Data Team has ensured that the shift to student-level collections through MOSIS is successful and that the data needs of the various Department programs are met.
- An additional method of data verification has come about due to the selection of districts for monitoring and grant opportunities based on district performance data.
- Data gathered through IMACS undergo verification by compliance supervisors and the Supervisors' determinations supersede district responses if different.

These efforts have allowed the Department to identify and correct many errors made by districts when submitting special education data. Due to this, most errors are corrected prior to federal data submissions.

2011-12 Improvement Activities

- Support the development and implementation of MOSIS.
- Provide information to state supervisors of instruction and school administrators regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA.
- Develop and manage web-based data system (FormHog) for management of contracts and data collection for statewide initiatives (SW-PBS, MIM, RtI and National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)).

Improvement Activity Discussion

MOSIS: As noted above, the Department has a student-level data collection system. The Department has worked to ensure that definitions and interpretations of data elements are accurate and consistent across programs. Extensive technical assistance to districts ensures smooth implementation and accuracy of data.

During 2009–10, the Department finalized and implemented a rubric for evaluating the timeliness and accuracy of district data submissions. Deadlines by which data must be certified through MOSIS were established and tracked. A system was put in place to regularly contact districts who had not yet certified their data in order to help them meet the deadline. For the 2011-12 school year, one district did not meet the deadline for the December child count submission, three districts did not meet the deadline for the educator course/assignment submission and one district did not meet the deadline for the

enrollment/attendance submission. This was an improvement over the timeliness of submissions for the 20010-11 school year. Staff work closely with districts to resolve accuracy issues, therefore all districts received full credit for the accuracy of data submissions.

Work with State Supervisors of Instruction and School Administrators to Discuss Data Accuracy and Use: While discussions specific to this topic have not been held, the topic is embedded in most trainings and conversations that involve the special education system of general supervision. District and Department personnel are aware that data are being used to trigger requirements for self-assessment purposes, select districts for on-site reviews, report to the public and provide local determinations to districts, among other things. All of these endeavors have emphasized the importance of data accuracy.

FormHog: The Office of Special Education has contracted with the company FormHog, Inc. to create and provide an on-line contract development and management system. The purpose of this system is to develop scopes of work and budgets, provide a central location for vendor contact information, store all information related to vendor contracts (e.g., contract appendices, signed contract agreements, reports, and invoices), store all definitions for terms used in the development of forms, and track vendor programmatic, impact, and fiscal activities. An approval process is built into the system to facilitate work flow for scope of work and budget development, processing invoices and reviewing reports. A data query and reporting tool has been developed. This tool enables Office of Special Education and other Department staff to evaluate vendor activities and use of funds and determine the alignment of vendor activities with SPP Improvement Activities and Indicators.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps

In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

State Response: Per OSEP instructions for this APR, the Indicator 20 Data Rubric is optional. Missouri chose not to include the rubric in this APR.